

240 B85s

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for two weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



Public Library
Kansas City, Mo.

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

BERNOWITZ ENVELOPE CO., K. C., MO.



THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN



ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS

New York ● Nashville

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE
COPYRIGHT, MCMXLII
BY WHITMORE & STONE

All rights in this book are reserved. No part of the text may be reproduced in any form without written permission of the publishers, except brief quotations used in connection with reviews in a magazine or newspaper.

PREFACE

This is a brief preface. It will contain only essentials.

It is indeed essential that I thank the Vanderbilt University School of Religion, and especially Dean John Keith Benton, for the courteous invitation to deliver the Cole Lectures of 1942. This book presents the substance of the lectures.

It is also essential that I state my attitude toward the provisions of the Cole Lectureship. The lectures are restricted to "a defense and advocacy of the Christian religion." To one who is not a Christian believer, this restriction would mean intellectual bondage. To one who is a Christian believer, on the contrary, it is a charter of freedom. The Cole Lecturer has no need to apologize for his allegiance to Christian values. He is assured of his right to defend his faith in such manner as seems best to him.

The Cole Lectureship was the occasion, but not really the cause, of the writing of this book. The book was written because it had to be. For some time I have felt the need of putting into words what the spiritual life means to me. The unpopularity

PREFACE

of the words "spirit" and "spiritual" could not deter me. Even good Dr. Buttrick's book on *Prayer* (also based in part on Cole Lectures) has not changed my purpose, although I was alarmed when I read in it that "spirit" is a "misty" word, and "spiritual" a "vacuous, stratospheric" one. After that, I had to write this book more than ever, to show that spirit is real, practical, and important. In these days of cruelty and materialistic aggression, it is still true that only spirit is eternal, only spirit is truly real, only spirit is the goal of life.

For my peace of mind it is also essential that I thank my wife and my faithful assistants, Jannette E. Newhall, Alice W. Baily, and Sheldon C. Ackley, for their help in whipping the manuscript into shape. Dean-Emeritus Albert C. Knudson, my loyal friend of many years, has also read the manuscript and helped me with valuable suggestions.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

Boston University

May 6, 1942

CONTENTS

I. WHAT IS SPIRIT?	9
What do we think of when we think of spirit?—The fate of spirit—The marks of spirit. (Conscious, Powerful, Noble, Rich, Courageous, Free, Rational, Personal)	
II. SPIRIT AS PERSONAL	38
Spirit and personality distinguished—Spirit and personality related—Actual personality as potential spirit—Spirit as a system of personal values	
III. SPIRIT AS SOCIAL	69
All consciousness is social—In what senses persons are nevertheless individual—In what senses spirit is social—Group spirit—The unity of the personal-social spirit	
IV. SPIRIT AS DIVINE	103
The subjectivity of spiritual values—The objectivity of spiritual ideals—May there be faith in spirit without faith in Divine Spirit?—What men worship is Eternal Personal Spirit—The meaning of Divine Spirit	
V. SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING	142
Spirit as eternal—The Eternal as active development—Spirit as change of level of the conscious life—Spirit as increase of value—"You Would Not Think"	
VI. SPIRIT AS FREE	176
Ambiguity of freedom—Spiritual freedom—Spiritual freedom and personal liberty—Spiritual freedom and political liberty—Spirit and the <i>Zeitgeist</i>	
INDEX	215

CHAPTER I

WHAT IS SPIRIT?

"We have not even heard whether there is a Holy Spirit."

"Vague words like 'democracy' and 'spiritual' are used to cover absence of thought."

The first of these two sentences was spoken to Paul by "certain disciples" at Ephesus who had been "baptized," as the ancient language reads, "unto John's baptism." The second of the sentences was written by a modern philosopher,¹ C. DeLisle Burns, who has been baptized into the baptism of semantics—which is itself no unspiritual experience.

If John's disciples do not know about the Spirit and Mr. Burns finds it vague, is there then no Holy Spirit at all? Is there nothing spiritual? Is there not even any democracy? No honest person can deny that Mr. Burns is right when he declares that the word "spiritual" is often used to cover absence of thought. It has sometimes, and often, been taken

¹ In *Ethics*, 52(1941), 118.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

to denote a definite type of emotional experience, which is not thought; or acceptance of a specific body of dogmas, without thought; or romantic aspirations, still without regard to thought. Yet it would be folly to infer from the abuse of a word, and the antipathies that it creates among certain people, that the word has no legitimate meaning. There is often absence of thought when love and marriage are mentioned; but there is true love, and there is happy marriage.

It is always unfortunate when we use words without meaning, but it is peculiarly unfortunate when our minds confer no definite meaning on the words which we prize most highly. To be deeply devoted to we know not what, to regard the indefinite as essential to our happiness, to worship vacuity—these attitudes are as senseless as they are common.

When experience is serious, for good or for evil, there is nothing indefinite in one's attitude. In *King Richard III* Shakespeare represents Richard as having dreamed of those whom he had murdered. Here is Richard's interview with Ratcliff:

K. Rich. O Ratcliff, I fear, I fear.

Rat. Nay, good my lord, be not afraid of shadows.

K. Rich. By the Apostle Paul, shadows tonight
 Have struck more terror to the soul of Richard

WHAT IS SPIRIT?

Than can the substance of ten thousand soldiers
Armed in proof.

In Richard's spirit, evil and afraid, there was nothing indefinite. Spirit is real and inexorable.

Self-respect, social responsibility, logic, and religious reverence all point to one alternative: *define or deny!* This alternative needs explanation. If we ignorantly worship "the unknown God," the maxim "define or deny" does not mean to define God or else deny him. It means, instead, to define the God we worship or else deny that we are doing anything meaningful in worshiping such a God. To worship "I know not what" is perilously close to adoring our own ignorance, unless we are able to define an object for our worship other than our ignorance. All living is trying to discover what we mean, what others mean, what the world and God mean. All living, whatever else it may or may not be, is defining. No longer, then, dare we postpone the attempt to define the spirit.

I

What do you and I think of when we think of spirit? What do we mean? We certainly use the word in a variety of senses. We say that the chil-

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

dren have high spirits when they are gay and reckless. On the other hand, a shadowy creature that is far from gay, a ghost, is called a spirit; and ghosts are often thought of as either dispirited or spiritless spirits, except when we read about Topper. To some, the word spirits suggests only alcohol and spirituous beverages—spirituous being cautiously distinguished from spiritual. To show spirit is to show enthusiasm, courage, energy. The word spirit thus far has not seemed to be vague or empty; it suffers from an excess of clear referents.

These popular uses of the word seem to have no relation to religion; let the reader be patient. Let him remember that enthusiasm means an experience in God, and that religious life partakes both of the joyful and vigorous, and also of the ghostly and invisible.

Turning more directly to spirit and the spiritual as religious words, we may as well admit at the start that to some these words are as a red rag is supposed to be to a bull—an irritation and an exasperation. Sensible, thoughtful Christians often take offense at a word that suggests to them emotional, nonethical surges of feeling. As St. Paul remarked in this connection, "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" The spirit-

WHAT IS SPIRIT?

ual trumpet has often given an uncertain sound. At the lips of some, on the contrary, it has given a far too certain sound. To be spiritual, to have the Spirit, means to these buglers but one experience—the experience of the second blessing. Unfortunately the scriptural basis of the theory of a specific second blessing consists partly of a mistranslation in the King James version. The Ephesians who declared their ignorance of the Spirit had been asked by Paul, according to the Authorized text, “Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?” This wording supports the theory that justification is one stage of Christian life, occurring when Christ is accepted, and sanctification a second stage, coming later when the Spirit is received. Unfortunately for the theory, the Greek can mean only: “Did ye receive the Holy Spirit when ye believed?” Thus, the theory of two separate experiences is denied by the original form of Paul’s question. In spite of this insecure basis, the view that the coming of the Spirit is and must be a definite second blessing has long persisted.

In the third quarter of the second century, a group of Phrygian Christians, led by Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla, opposing secularism in the Church, laid claim to a special experience and revelation of the Spirit, the Paraclete of St. John’s Gospel. This ex-

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

perience was accompanied by frenzies and ecstasies, and by a proclamation that the end was at hand, specifically to occur at Pepuza. His contemporaries compared the "prophecies" of Montanus to madness. A Montanist, Theodotos, died while in a state of ecstasy. Tertullian, opponent of rational religion, fell prey to this Montanism. Although officially repudiated by the Church, Montanism survived for some years thereafter.

The phenomenon of speaking with tongues is associated with the Spirit in the New Testament. In various forms it has continued to the present day, both on mission fields and also among certain religious sects. Invariably these extraordinary and abnormal experiences lead their subjects to claim a higher type of life. Montanus, for example, held that he and his followers alone were "pneumatics" (filled with *pneuma* or spirit), while other Christians were mere "psychics" (men of the *psyche* or soul, connected with bodily life).

To most Christians, however, such expressions of the Spirit have seemed to be more pitiable than enviable. They are usually taken to be evidence of mental or physical disorder rather than signs of a higher level of life. The simple Christian has found the revelation of the Spirit in a totally different kind

WHAT IS SPIRIT?

of experience from this. In faith and hope and love; in communion with God; in the devoted lives of men like Thomas à Kempis, George Fox, John Woolman, Kagawa, and Rufus M. Jones; in quiet and strong experiences of God and God's relation to human life, the simple man rightly sees the work of the Spirit.

Looking at the meaning of spirit from another point of view, let us seek light from etymology. The Hebrew *ru'ach* and the Greek *pneuma* both mean a blast of wind, as well as spirit. Another Greek word for spirit, *thumos*, emphasizes the life of passion; while the Latin *spiritus* means breathing. These are words of power and life. It is interesting to note how the derivatives of *spiro* refer to various degrees and levels of physical and spiritual life. Respire is to breathe; perspire is even more physical; transpire, originally referring to physical exhalation or perspiration, came to have the more general and intellectual meaning of "become known." To conspire is a spiritual act, even if unworthy; to suspire is to sigh—a physical symbol of a spiritual mood. To aspire is spiritual longing in the loftiest sense; and, finally, to expire is to experience the severing of spirit from body. The testimony of language is that spirit is life.

The nature of spirit has engaged the thought of the

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

greatest minds. Plato, Paul, John, and Augustine all struggled with the problem of spirit; and all associated it with the life of ideal values. Berkeley made active spirit the fundamental principle of his philosophy. In modern times, Hegel's great *Phenomenology of the Mind* (1807) was a map of the spiritual life. Rudolf Eucken's lifework, ever since his book on *The Unity of the Spiritual Life* (1888), was directed toward lifting men's thought from the pettily human to the truly spiritual values. Auguste Sabatier, in *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit* (1899), was concerned with the freedom of the spirit. Henry Churchill King's work *The Seeming Unreality of the Spiritual Life* (1908) raised searching questions. B. H. Streeter and others, in *The Spirit* (1919), explored various aspects of the problem. N. Hartmann, *Das Problem des geistigen Seins* (1933), is a penetrating analysis. Recently G. F. Thomas has presented a penetrating interpretation of philosophy's contribution in *The Spirit and Its Freedom* (1939). N. Berdyaev's *Spirit and Reality* (1939) is vivid and original. George Santayana has capped his life's insights with his book on *The Realm of Spirit* (1940)—a spirit that for him means escape from the hurly-burly of life. Rufus M. Jones has distilled his mystical faith in *Spirit in Man* (1941), and

WHAT IS SPIRIT?

J. W. Buckham has presented a personalistic view in *The Inner World* (1941). These books are but a fraction of the literature that seeks to interpret spirit. Philosophical writers, as has been said, emphasize the ideal values for which spirit aspires, and so tend to lay less stress on the idea of spirit as the breath and power of life. In the history of the word, both aspects are present.

II

When Jesus was preparing his disciples for the coming of the Spirit, he said: "Tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." In this sentence Jesus pointed out the dialectic of the Spirit—its two poles that forever cause tensions in the spiritual life, and the interaction between which is the source of spiritual vitality. Spirit is power, and spirit is from on high. The fate of the spirit in the world has been determined by the conflict between these two poles. Those who sought power would often enough find power—power that came from the body and man's lower nature or his mental diseases. If it was power, that sufficed. Anything would pass muster, so long as it moved men, no matter where or why. Pneumatics are often gross pragmatists, satisfied with any belief or experience

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

if only it produces abnormal results. While Montanists and fanatics have been taking over the "power," theologians and philosophers have been preoccupied with what is "on high." They have turned their eyes away from the caves of this earth and the prisoners in them, and, filled with that contempt of the world which Santayana regards as the very essence of spirit, have dealt with eternal and unchanging Ideas, transcendental objects, heaven, and ethereal essences. Many a Thales thus engaged has fallen down a well, to the glee of Thracian serving maids. Judicious angels have always challenged stargazing idealists with the rudely inquisitive question, "Why stand ye gazing up into heaven?" The angels have been more concerned about how Jesus was going to transform the earth than about his location in heaven.

The tension between the friends of "power" and the friends of "on high" is necessary. It is spirit's struggle for self-preservation and development. To seek power for its own sake is ignoble madness; to look only on high is noble weakness. Yet spirit without power is as futile as spirit without high aims is wicked. Each aspect of spirit without the other is the death of spirit. Yet each pole, perceiving the death of spirit, blames that death on the other pole.

WHAT IS SPIRIT?

Spirit weakens, grows pale, suspires, and all but expires today. The pole of "power" exclaims: If only you had never looked on high, if only you had given up all that intellectualism and theology! The pole of "on high" cries back: If only you had abandoned all thought of power and had solely contemplated heavenly truth!

In its negation, each pole is wrong. In its affirmation, each is right. Emotional orgies and mere learned technicalities are alike fatal to the spirit. But emotional power and devotion to ideal values are both essential to its survival. Just as the denial of emotional power brings on "The Last Puritan," so the denial of ideal values bring on the first fascist.

The fate of the spirit depends on the union of power with the highest. Santayana, who despairs of the power, but clings to the highest, asked himself once whether morality were not a worse enemy of spirit than immorality.² The "determination to wash the world white and clean" he called unspiritual. But if our view of the polarity of spirit be true, Santayana errs. Spirit without power to transform life dies; and the essential meaning of the ideals of spirit is not merely that the world is wicked, but that the world ought to be saved. Spirit is faith in the

² See *Platonism and the Spiritual Life* (1927), p. 84.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

inseparable union between existence and value. Existence ought to be good. Good ought to exist. The highest is concerned about the lowest, and the wildest energies are more powerful when controlled by law. Away with all talk about separation of head and heart; away with all partisanship for either!

III

What, then, is the nature of the spirit, this dipolar reality? What are the marks of the spirit? Is spirit really vague, as Burns thought, or is it clearly distinguished from other aspects of our world?

1. First of all, spirit is *conscious experience*. It is no merely physical state of our body or of things around it. It is nothing material; our concept of spirit cannot be reduced to our concept of the material, although an idealistic philosophy may elevate our concept of matter to the spiritual level. At best, matter is an incomplete view of the real. Spirit views the real in the light of consciousness; spirit is an evaluation of consciousness. To know, to feel, to will, to grow in conscious scope and power—this is spiritual. If “these stones” were to become bread, no spiritual transaction would have occurred; but when stony ideas and hearts become nourishing ideals and noble conscious choices, ordinary human beings

WHAT IS SPIRIT?

become spirits. It is true that when he said "not by bread alone" our Lord recognized clearly the importance of bread, as he did in the petition, "Give us this day our daily bread." No bread, no spirit in this world. Spirit needs existence. But bread is no better than a stone if, having eaten it, we do nothing to bring the kingdom of the spirit; and that kingdom is in the conscious experiences of men, their struggles and their joys.

2. Secondly, as we have already said, spirit is *powerful experience*. It is not passive conscious contemplation alone, although such contemplation is a phase of the life of spirit. But even contemplation cannot be sustained without a powerful will to direct it and without a powerful basis for the continued existence of the contemplator. Captain J. A. Hadfield, in his chapter in Streeter's volume on *The Spirit*, and Dr. W. G. Chanter, in his correspondence course for the Commission on Courses of Study of The Methodist Church, have laid special stress on this aspect of power.

The first mention of the Spirit of God in the Bible is, of course, in Genesis 1:2. The Spirit moved upon the face of the waters—manifested power. Dr. Mil-lar Burrows tells us that the word for "moved" should perhaps be translated "soared," so that the

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

writer may have compared the Spirit to an eagle in full flight.³ The gifts of the Spirit in New Testament times were empowerings. Paul lists them in I Corinthians 12 as wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, working of miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, divers kinds of tongues, the interpretation of tongues. "But," he summarizes, "all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit." He, it is true, is chiefly interested here in the unity of the Spirit in its diversity of operation; but he brings out just as clearly the power of the Spirit. It "worketh"; it "energizes," as the Greek suggests. There is something a bit pathetic in the fact that a modern goes to the Greek to find the power that the age no longer finds in God!

The early Christians thought of the power in very concrete terms. It is probably just as well that The Gospel According to the Hebrews was excluded from the canon, but one of its vivid stories is preserved in a fragment where Jesus is the speaker. "The Holy Spirit, my mother," he is represented as saying, "just seized me by one of my hairs and carried me off to the high mountain Tabor." Such a spectacle, in all literalness, few moderns would regard as spiritual; yet the story serves to figure forth the sense of power

³ *What Mean These Stones?* (1941), p. 45.

WHAT IS SPIRIT?

which the early Christians associated with the Spirit. It was no mere breathing; it was "a rushing mighty wind."

Thus the experience of the Spirit is the experience of new ability, new might, a radical change of some sort. Not all power is spiritual, and not all spirit is Holy Spirit. But spirit is power. It changes the weak and dispirited consciousness into strong and energetic will. Longing for the spirit is longing for power. "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God." The psalmist's whole being needs more life, needs the source of life, needs power; and so he turns to God the all-powerful, the living one. What, then, is Santayana thinking of when he says that spirit is "distinguished from worldly morality and intelligence" by "disillusion"?⁴ Disillusion is sophistication, and sophistication is not even wisdom; for wisdom is a sense of values, and sophisticated disillusion is despair of values, and even wisdom falls short of the power of the spirit. Santayana is far from grasping what spirit means in the Jewish-Christian religion at its best. Berkeley was nearer right when he defined spirit as active, "a perceiving, active being," or "one simple

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 83.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

undivided active being.”⁵ Philosophies which have dwelt on the activity of mind have been spiritual philosophies; those which have regarded the mind as purely passive have been unspiritual. Spirituality cannot be without power; power can be, but ought not to be, without spirituality.

3. It is not enough to say that spirit is powerful conscious experience; it must also be *noble conscious experience*. At the word “noble” certain semanticians are sure to take umbrage. They will aver that noble refers to nothing but the emotional state of the speaker. In this they will be only partly right. A noble life is, it is true, a life of worthy emotion; but noble emotion is distinguished from ignoble by its rational character. To be exact, noble emotion is emotion directed toward the upbuilding of conscious life as a whole—in myself and in others. Its nobility lies in its scope, its rationality, its unselfishness, and its devotion to ideals.

Spirit, then, is a movement of the mind away from the lower levels of consciousness; or, to be more precise, it is a movement which includes the lower levels, but transforms them by their relation to personality as a whole. Sensations, therefore, are not spiritual until they are related to the interests of the

⁵ *Principles of Human Knowledge*, I, 2, 27.

WHAT IS SPIRIT?

total spirit. Then, and only then, does the daily round of sense experience, both in its monotonies and in its ecstasies, acquire spiritual meaning and elevation. It is this nobility that Eucken has in mind in his frequent contrasts between the pettily human—the *kleinmenschlich*—and the spiritual life.

The love of God itself is not necessarily spiritual. If it be regarded as one more interest, in addition to worldly interests which are left unaffected by it, if it be merely an additional activity to undertake, then it is not spiritual. It may be mechanical, or institutional, or sentimental. It does not become spiritual until it actually ennobles life and relates it to the plan and purpose of the whole. Not that spirituality requires infallible knowledge of divine purposes—not that! But spirit does require the love of God, the yearning for integrity, for unity of plan, and rationality of purpose. It is this that constituted the nobility of Plato's devotion to the Idea of the Good, and of John's teaching that God is love. Anything lower than the level of noble existence is not spirituality.

4. Yet in speaking of powerful, noble conscious experience, we have still fallen short of the full idea of spirit. The spiritual life is a *rich conscious experience*, rich in ideal goods. It is this factor of spiritual

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

riches that fanatics most often overlook. They dwell on some "one thing needful" and forget that they need not only to be "rich in good works," but also to experience "the riches of his glory" in the divine Spirit. Nothing is more of a travesty on the spiritual life than a meager, poverty-stricken experience for which God means hardly more than a symbol for a dogma or a single emotional experience of a conversion dated perhaps some twenty years ago.

The idea of spiritual richness appears in many forms. Plato's charioteer achieves spirituality by driving the differently-disposed horses. Jesus speaks of "true riches," and of the abundant life, which was not invented by a modern American president. Again we may refer to Paul's teaching of "diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." In modern philosophy the richness of the spiritual life is perhaps best expressed by the brief formula of Hegel: "The true is the whole." For Hegel, the true does not mean the exact or the correct. We may have them far short of the whole. But the true, rather, means the adequate, the sufficient. Thus his words mean: The sufficient life is the complete life. Or: The adequate spirit is the spirit that discovers all the possibilities of experience and rules them by its ideals.

In the light of this view of the richness of spirit,

WHAT IS SPIRIT?

we can see that the fanatical religionist and the abstract philosopher are both unspiritual for essentially the same reason. The fanatic dwells on his conversion, his second blessing, without due concern for the full and rich development of spiritual values. The abstract philosopher, such as Santayana, tells us that "spirit is essentially open and blank,"⁶ thus reducing spirit to bare intuition, no matter of what. The fanatic and the philosopher both deprive spirit of its richness, and thus leave spiritual life all but empty. In their eagerness to find the point where spirit begins, they tarry there too long, and the richness of spiritual power escapes them both.

5. Spirit is also *courageous experience*. Courage alone is not spirit. That is to say, not all willingness to incur danger is spiritual, however spirited it may be. But our very use of the word spirited implies that there is something akin to spirit in the impetuous urge to rush into unknown perils recklessly. The person who fears nothing in the presence of danger is abnormal; he is, as Aristotle remarked, "mad or else insensitive to pain."⁷ It is the testimony of military men that every soldier feels fear in the midst of battle, the coward being the one who

⁶ *The Realm of Spirit* (1940), p. 12.

⁷ *Nic. Eth.* III, vii, 7.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

fears and runs away, and the hero being the one who fears and stays at his post. Danger thus elicits a spiritual power in man, the use or misuse of which reveals whether his spirit is akin to the Holy Spirit or the Evil Spirit. Aristotle's definition of "the courageous man" well reveals the spiritual nature of true courage: "The courageous man is he that endures or fears the right things and for the right purpose and in the right manner and at the right time, and who shows confidence in a similar way." ⁸

Plato had made an even clearer connection between spirit and courage. Having defined the soul as "that which moves itself," ⁹ and having thus established the principle of spiritual power and energy, he went on to tell his famous myth of the charioteer. Reason, the charioteer, drives the two horses, one noble and the other quite the opposite. The noble steed corresponds to that part of the soul which Plato calls *thumos*, or spirit, a term which Homer often uses to mean courage. This spirited steed is "a friend of honor, joined with temperance and modesty, and a follower of true glory," says Plato. "He needs no whip, but is guided only by the word of command, and by reason." ¹⁰ Thus Plato pictures

⁸ *Nic. Eth.* III, vii, 5 (tr. Rackham).

⁹ *Phaedrus* 245.

¹⁰ *Phaedrus* 253D (tr. Fowler).

WHAT IS SPIRIT?

the nature of spiritual courage as noble obedience to the ideal, in contrast with the wild and unrestrained actions of the ignoble steed appetite.

The Old Testament abounds in pleas to "be strong and of a good courage." The New Testament is different. In view of the spiritual heroism of the early Christians, it is rather surprising to find a word meaning courage appearing only once in the New Testament. When Paul had escaped from the shipwreck, and finally he and his companions were welcomed at Appii Forum by brethren from Rome, "he thanked God, and took courage." Courage was at the very heart of a religion based on the teachings of one who "stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem."¹¹ Perhaps the children of the Christian spirit were so busy in exemplifying courage that they did not find it necessary to talk about it. Subjected to frequent arrests, stonings, and final martyrdom, St. Paul is a living model of courage; and it required effort for him to become reconciled to men like Peter and John Mark when they evidenced a lack of it.

The very nature of the spiritual life is such as to require courage; for spirit is in itself a rebuke to the

¹¹The spirit of courage is exemplified frequently in the advice, "Fear not" (Matt. 10:26 and many other passages). Dean-Emeritus Albert C. Knudson has called my attention to the excellent discussion of courage in Ernest F. Scott's book, *The Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, p. 106.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

ordinary level of life, and it often elicits ill-will, envy, or aggressive persecution. Heroes of the spirit lie in prison, are given hemlock to drink, are crucified or tortured. From St. Stephen to U-Boat Captain Martin Niemöller, the inner life of the spirit has supplied men with the courage which they needed. Without courage, spirit would have vanished long ago from among men.

6. The experience of the spirit, furthermore, is an *experience of freedom*. The Exodus pattern is a chart of the life of the spirit. Men are oppressed; they live in slavery. Within them there arises a longing for freedom, a Moses. No outer circumstances can stand against the power of the spirit; the Egyptians are spoiled, their army drowned in the Red Sea, and the Israelites well on their way to new experiences of the hardships of freedom in the wilderness before Egypt realizes what has happened to its slave nation. The spiritual life is a protest against oppression. It is freedom from outer circumstance—what the Stoics called “independence of externals.” It is freedom from bondage to the body: “Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.” It is freedom from the law—from its formal rites and its dogmatic and impersonal standards. In respect to his theory of freedom, Kant is rightly called

WHAT IS SPIRIT?

the philosopher of Protestantism. He has given classic expression to the doctrine of spiritual freedom in his principle of moral autonomy. By virtue of autonomy, man is obligated "only to his own legislation—and yet to a universal one." The spirit is free because it imposes laws on itself, yet only those laws which it perceives to be universally binding for all spirits. Spirit is accordingly free from every foreign power; no heteronomous force can compel it to act.

It is true that Kant's view of freedom is inadequate. What he tells us of the spirit is necessary, but it is not sufficient. Freedom is not merely a legislation imposed by the spirit on itself, but it is a life lived in accord with that legislation. Further, spiritual legislation is directed not merely toward the choices of individuals, but also toward a society of persons. The problem of the free choice of an individual is simpler than the problem of a free life from the dawn of responsibility to the grave; but the problem of the free individual life, difficult as it may be, is incomparably easier to solve than the problem of the free society. Although Kant recognized the social problem, he could not solve it with his lack of historical sense and his individualistic and abstract ethics. Hegel saw more clearly that the spirit is truly

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

free to achieve its ends only in an ordered society in which the conditions of the co-operative development of spirit exist. Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, in turn, saw more clearly than Hegel that the free development of man's spirit requires free interplay between the free initiative and autonomy of individuals and the security and control of a common order.

To assert that any man or state has ever found or is likely to find a fully adequate solution to the problem of freedom would be folly. Yet one thing remains clear: as long as man is not free, so long the spirit will struggle for freedom. The struggle will often be blind and desperate, but the human spirit cannot be permanently chained. This is the verdict of history, no mere idealistic dream. Labor troubles, wars, unrest among youth, despair, rebellions, subversive activities, multiplying isms—all of these are results of the fact that the human spirit is not free, and for the most part does not know how to become free.

Wherever the spirit operates, there is a yearning for freedom, and, on its highest levels, an experiencing of freedom attained in an unfree world. The hat on the head of the Quaker in the presence of kings is symbolic of the freedom of the spirit—the inner

WHAT IS SPIRIT?

voice that cannot be regimented by any earthly power.

7. Kant saw that freedom was not truly free merely because it was self-imposed. True freedom is the recognition of limits and conditions; it is the self-imposition of law. The life of the spirit, therefore, is *rational experience* as well as experience of freedom—rational in order to be effectively free.

Rational experience is an expression readily misunderstood. It means inclusive, consistent, orderly experience. It does not mean the experience of incessant reflection on logic and mathematics; it does not mean perpetual syllogizing; nor does it mean a state of continuous doubt or skepticism. The contrary to reason, in the highest sense, is neither faith nor emotion. Neither faith nor emotion need be unreasonable. The contrary to reason is the irrational. The irrational is deliberately exclusive—it closes its eyes to facts or truths; it is inconsistent, neither dependably reliable nor unreliable, neither wholly sincere nor wholly insincere; and it is disorderly, uncontrolled, unrelated to any principle or purpose, devoted to having its own way, yet having no definite “way.”

From the definitions it is clear that spirit is rational. It is inclusive, consistent, and orderly. It

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

is a principle of the control of experience. The unspiritual life is one that is uncontrolled by ideals. The spiritual life is one that is controlled by ideals. But the fire and aspiration, the power and richness of the spiritual life do not consist of reasoning processes and for the most part are not created by them. Reason is not the creator, but the orderer. Without order, which is heaven's first law, there can be no genuine spirituality. With order there may be meagerness and emptiness. Thus the rational ordering is not the whole of spirituality, but it is one of its best friends and most faithful servants. To recur to the figure of Plato, the noble steed of spirit may be a passionate one, but it is not driverless. Or, to use a more modern figure, the powerful and emotional aspects of the spirit may be compared to steam. Steam escaping and at large either dissipates into futile vapor or scalds and burns and kills. Steam in a boiler, under rational control, is available energy, and may propel a railroad train or heat a skyscraper. The Holy Spirit is power, inspiration, freedom. But it is also the Word, the Logos; and the Lord is the Spirit. The Spirit cannot be identified with any and every emotional frenzy; we need to test the spirits. The Holy Spirit can be identified by its holiness, its conformity to ideals of goodness, truth,

WHAT IS SPIRIT?

beauty, and reverence. The human spirit can become like the Holy Spirit in so far as it tests itself by those same ideals and lives by them. Justin Martyr was right in seeing the same Logos in Heraclitus, in Socrates, and in Jesus. Christianity is a spiritual religion not by virtue of being irrational or by its complete divergence from all the life of the spirit in other religions and philosophies. It is spiritual because it brings to its highest expression the very same rational aspiration for ideal goodness and beauty that has been stirring the breast of every man who has lived in the world.

In the light of this discussion, spirit may be defined as power governed by truth. Power that disregards truth—whether on the battlefield or in the pulpit—is unspiritual; and truth that is weak and powerless is also unspiritual. Spirit is important truth, using and ordering otherwise unimportant truth. Spirit is power obedient to truth and serving true ideals. Neither aspect of the rational experience of the spirit can be sacrificed without destroying the spiritual life itself.

8. Finally it needs to be said that spiritual life is *personal experience*. We sometimes speak, under Hegel's influence, of the *Zeitgeist*, the spirit of the age, or, under LeBon's influence, of the spirit of a

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

mob. We almost persuade ourselves that there is a real something "in the air" other than all of us individual persons, something that governs our times and compels us to act and feel as we do, or that renders a person in a mob merely its instrument. All such language is mere mythology. There is no social mind other than the social feelings in our own mind, produced by interaction with others. There is no mob spirit except in you and in me. All experience, and especially all spiritual experience, is in, of, and for individual persons. If there is any superindividual spiritual life, we know nothing of it.

Nor is spiritual life, in any literal sense, a devotion to impersonal causes. There is no spiritual meaning in devotion to things, as such, or to abstractions. There is a real meaning, however, behind the insistence on impersonal causes and ideals. The word impersonal has the very peculiar force of meaning universally personal. An impersonal cause is indeed spiritual if it is a devotion to the universe of all persons, and to all phases of personality. But an impersonal cause that promoted no personal values, bettered no personal consciousness, made no difference to any individual, would be both unspiritual and absurd. The love of truth is a spiritual cause, not because there is much theory without practical

WHAT IS SPIRIT?

application, but because the knowledge of truth is in itself a joy of contemplation, an enlargement of the spirit, an instrument of further growth to the personality. Thus there is no truly impersonal truth, no impersonal cause, except such causes as are hostile to the search for truth or to the meaning and existence of persons. Impersonality in the sense of devotion of the person to all persons, fairly, justly, and impartially, is one of the loftiest spiritual values; but it is a personal conscious experience. Because of its personal root and personal reference, the ideal of impartiality would betray and destroy itself if it were to ignore individual differences or personal peculiarities. The spiritual life is the highest development of each person with his unique powers and talents.

This attempt to define the spirit began with the confession that the spiritual life seems to some a very vague term. Vagueness means lack of detail, lack of reference. On investigation spirit has turned out to be the very opposite of vague. It is crowded with a wealth of detail. A crowd is not vague, even if it is hard to become acquainted with all its members. Spirit, we have said, is 'conscious, powerful, noble, rich, courageous, free, rational, personal experience. Spirit may be very difficult to attain, may be too lofty for ordinary mortals; but who can call it vague?

CHAPTER II

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

In the previous chapter spirit has been defined as a powerful reinforcement of the ideal life, a drive toward ideal goals. In a sense we have seen that spirit is personal; yet in a sense it is not personal.

In much of our ordinary language we speak of spirit and person as synonymous. Yet there is always a tinge of eulogy, of the exceptional and ideal, in our use of the word spirit. We may say that Jones is a noble spirit. If we said that he is a noble person, we should mean almost the same thing. Yet to call a man a person may be almost an insult; it may imply vulgarity—that person! It may indeed also be a term of praise and respect. The representative person of the community is etymologically the parson, and sometimes actually. To say, "He is a real person," is to regard the man we are speaking of as fulfilling the ideal of personality in some or all respects; he is what Hegel would call the *Begriff*—the comprehensive ideal—of a person. Nevertheless, in ordi-

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

nary usage the word person either carries some of its origin with it (*persona* being a mask), as when we speak of impersonation, or else has a tendency to become debased coinage.

The word spirit has no such tendency, in spite of the temptation lying in the use of the expression alcoholic spirits. To speak of a man's spirit is always to speak of something ennobling, or at least stirring and powerful. The worst one could mean by calling a person a spirit would be to raise a doubt whether he were a ghost or a disembodied personality. This, however, would be far from trivial or uncomplimentary. It would at least imply uncanny powers, ability to survive death, something supernatural. There is nothing vulgar or common about being a spirit. It follows that, in spite of philosophers like Berkeley, who identify spirit with person, and prefer to speak of men as spirits in order to avoid trinitarian complications about the nature of the oneness or plurality of personality, nevertheless most men, whether colloquially or technically, would like to make some distinction between spirit and person.

The point seems to be that spirit is personal, at least in the sense that it is an attribute of conscious personality; spirit, however, does not include the whole of our personal consciousness, nor does every

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

person achieve the life of spirit. Spirit is a potentiality of the person, and a special potentiality.

Every person is in part unspiritual. All weak moments, all dim and shadowy consciousness, all sensation in so far as it is not mastered by ideals, everything evil, shameful, poor, cowardly, irrational, inert, lazy, mechanical—all this is unspiritual, and altogether too much of this abounds in the most spiritual of souls. In a sense, we may call the unspiritual attitude the impersonal attitude in so far as this means treating oneself or others without regard to the highest possibilities of their personality. In another sense, as we saw in the previous chapter, there is an impersonal attitude that is spiritual; if impersonal means fair and nonpartisan, combining a sense of justice with an ability to rise above one's petty and private concerns, then the impersonal is the spiritual. This double meaning of the impersonal reflects the ambiguity of the personal, which we are striving in this discussion to explain, if not wholly to dispel.

It is evident that the relation between person and spirit is a fundamental question for everyone who aspires to be a spiritual person. To be a person is not enough. What, then, are the relations between spirit and personality?

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

I

First of all, let us try to distinguish as sharply as possible between spirit and personality. In its earliest and lowest uses, spirit means the ghost or shade of the man. Whatever strange powers a spirit may have, in this sense, it does not have bodily powers. It is disembodied. As the risen Christ says, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones." However, for philosophical thought a personality is not flesh and bones any more than is the spirit. Socrates in prison could truly say that it was not his flesh and bones that had caused him to obey the judges, but rather his obedience to the laws of Athens. But the purpose of the use of the term spirit to mean a ghost is to designate something disembodied, something superphysical or supernatural, while a person is usually thought of as embodied. This does not settle the question of the degree of value in each, for it remains a question whether the values that come from the body are higher than the values that come from the spirit. One does not need to be an ascetic or a dualist to affirm decisively that no experience having its cause in bodily states or conditions possesses even the slightest degree of true value until it has been mastered, interpreted, and controlled by spiritual ideals.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

Be that as it may, this primitive identification of spirit with ghostly shade is a declaration that spirit is not matter, not body, and is independent of it in some sense.

Although the ghostly spirit must have died, or its body must have died, before it could be a ghost, yet the word spirit is almost a synonym for life. "The breath of life" in Genesis 6:17 is translated in the Greek of the Septuagint as "*pneuma zoes*"—"spirit of life." The theme of the Revelator, of the Spirit and the bride in Revelations 22:17 is, "Take the water of life freely." The Johannine Jesus declares that "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." Spirit and life are the same, but what kind of life? Neither spirit nor personality can properly be identified with mere biological existence.

We are nearer to a distinction between spirit and personality when we remember that Plato's *thumos* is one account of spirit. By it Plato meant the fiery and "spirited" aspect of our being. For Plato, spirit in this sense is plainly not the whole of personality, but one aspect which needs co-ordination with the others. The whole personality would include man's entire experience, his consciousness as a whole in all its actual and possible development. Spirit in this

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

sense of Plato's would be the tendency to energetic expression of our powers.

But, as we saw in the previous chapter, spirit is not rightly understood when identified with any powerful impulse of our being. A man's spirit is not merely his impulses, but, more fundamentally, his direction of those impulses. Thus spirit means the intention or the attitude of personality, the "set" of one's life. It is what James had in mind when he defined a self as "a fighter for ends." Yet it is not true that all experiences of selves or persons are fights for ends; many experiences are passive enjoyments or sufferings, aimless or dreamy or blasé in tone. The fight for ends is a definitely spiritual aspect of our personality. A person who does not care, or who feels that no end is important enough to strive for, is a typically unspiritual person. In a sense, the direction of our purposes toward a goal involves the whole of our personality; and a life in which the direction toward goals occupied the consciousness at all times, and served as the organizing and interpreting principle for all of consciousness, would, in so far forth, be wholly spiritual.

Thus far we have omitted one very important consideration. Spirit, namely, may be good or evil. All that we have said so far might apply to evil spirits as

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

well as to good. The demons oppose the work of Christ. The *daimonion* of Socrates warns him against evil. Yet both demons and *daimonion* are spirits. If we are to generalize here, we may infer that spirit is one's attitude toward value. Spirit, then, is one's interest in good or evil. Indifference to values, to ideals, and to conscience is lack of spirit. If we ask how this relates spirit to person, the answer is plain. A person is a conscious self able to develop ideal values. A spirit is a person in so far as he has actually developed a conscious attitude toward ideal values. In the small child, the spirit is slumbering while the little person learns its way about the physical world. The child is a person only because it is a potential spirit. But until the spiritual potentialities are awakened and used the child remains on a subpersonal level.

Let it be added that this definition of spirit does not identify the spirit with the person. There is always personal consciousness that is not an interest in values. In much dull, neutral consciousness neither good nor evil is our concern, but, as Santayana would say, mere intuition of essences. Santayana makes his great mistake when he identifies such disinterested intuition with spirituality. In his latest and most baffling work, which we have previously quoted, he

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

tells us that spirit must be "without commitments."¹ Just as he would deprive spirit of commitments to values or causes, so too he would deprive spirit of power; power and spirit he regards as opposites.² So committed is he to the ideal of the uncommitted spirit that he is guilty of one of his rare errors in scholarship in this connection. He is interpreting the Jesus of John's Gospel, and declares that Spirit is "*sent* into this world" from without; "it does not command this world, much less create it."³ Santayana is right in saying that the Johannine Jesus is conscious of being sent into the world. But he is wrong in saying that Spirit neither commands nor creates the world. After all, the Son is sent to redeem the world precisely because the Creator must be the Redeemer. "All things were made by him. . . . In him was life. . . . The world was made by him, and the world knew him not." The spiritual gospel, contrary to Santayana, does not teach that Spirit has no commitments and no concern about the fate of values in the world. The world may find no value in Spirit; but Spirit is determined to find or create value in the world. A spiritual interest in the good is not a mere inactive

¹ *The Realm of Spirit*, p. 92.

² *Ibid.*, p. 285.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 203.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

and indifferent contemplation of the nature of all essences, including the essences of good and evil; it is an interest in the existence of good.

To be precise, spirit is not merely a commitment to ideals, which are the eternal principles of what ought to be; it is a commitment to values, that is, to the *realization* of ideals. Not contemplation of God but obedience to God is the heart of religion. The devil, we learn from the tolerant old lady, is industrious; in being industrious he is exemplifying the nature of spirit, its interest in the existence of the ends for which it strives. Santayana doubtless would find the very devilry of the devil to consist in his worldly concern about his success, but surely this view is wrong. Any spirit, good or evil, must be concerned about the actual existence of its values. Quaker "concern" is far more spiritual than any quietistic folding of the hands. If Santayana's view is spiritual, it is the spirituality of the Orient and not of the Occident; or at best it is a preliminary phase of spiritual life. Contemplation may be the root of the spirit but if it bear no fruits it is cast out as a branch and is withered. Eternal contemplation of the highest good, if it eventuates in nothing but contemplation, is barren, for it is not really interest in the good. It is only interest in keeping the good at

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

a distance. Psychic distance is a phase of aesthetic enjoyment, but it is not creative. It is release or escape from the task of the good. From this point of view, spirit is the principle which animates personality in so far as it is striving to remold itself in accordance with some ideal pattern. The good spirit or the bad spirit is what transforms a man, converts and sanctifies or perverts and debases him. In any case, spirit is the actual direction of the life toward its chosen end, be that end good or evil. Thus the spiritual life is the chief business of man, the most vital and electric part of his personality. What is not spirit is sluggish, indifferent, unimportant.

Somewhat similar to the primitive meaning of shade or ghost is the higher sense of spirit as the immortal soul. Here spirit has not merely the meaning of the disembodied, but rather the full ideal sense of the person with all its potentialities for eternal development. This is the meaning that we find in the words of Jesus on the cross, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." Spirit here is personality as immortal; not merely the negative phase of deathlessness or of triumph over death, but the positive phase of eternal life of value is implied. The difference between this belief and the primitive one is well brought out in James H. Leuba's book *The*

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

Belief in God and Immortality, in which the author contrasts the "primary belief," as concerned with ghosts, and the "modern conception," which he finds even less closely related to the primitive than we have found. Faith in immortality is faith in a spiritual metaphysics of some sort; it gives meaning and substance to Höffding's axiom of the conservation of values. If values are conserved in this universe, they must be conserved as actual spiritual experiences of actually existing persons. Spirit is thus the highest aspect and function of personality, a token of its right to survive bodily death and develop forever.

In the Hegelian philosophy we find another conception of spirit which is more remote from personality than any of those which we have considered. He speaks of "Objective Spirit," meaning, essentially, the spirit of a society. "The perfect embodiment of Spirit," he tells us in the Introduction to his *The Philosophy of History*, "is the State." In contrast with the realm of personal subjectivity, he points out that in the State alone—in Law, Morality, and Government—is the "positive reality and completion of freedom." The State is "the moral whole." This State, needless to say, is not merely the Prussian state, for he makes clear that when he is speaking of Germans and their "uninterrupted fidelity to native

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

character," he means the people of "Germany itself, Scandinavia, and England." His treatment of the Germanic world uniformly includes the Romanic—Italy, Spain, Portugal, and France. The defect of Hegel, then, is not that of petty nationalism. No, it lies in another direction. Nor is that defect to be found in any advocacy of tyranny. Hegel denounces the French Revolution, for example, as tyranny that could not last.

The real defect and unspirituality of Hegel's Objective Spirit lies rather in the conception that there is a Spirit that is not a person. The Objective Spirit is above all persons and is the State for which persons live; to die for it is their noblest act. As opposed to this idea of a superpersonal social mind which feeds on its constituent persons, there is the more empirical view that every stage of spirit, the most objective as well as the most subjective, is an aspect of the development of personal and individual consciousness. When a person is concerned about his own conscience, he is engaged in a spiritual struggle. When he is concerned about the relation of his life to the life of organized society, grateful for what others have done to contribute to the development of his life, loyal to the State which makes possible his private estate, he is also engaged in a spiritual struggle,

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

and on a higher level than the level of subjective consistency of conscience. Objective coherence is more rational, more moral, and more spiritual than subjective consistency. So far Hegel is right. But when he goes further and ascribes to the State another and a higher Spirit than the spirit of its members, he is venturing into mythology, with a Hero that becomes all too authoritative. When Hegel declares, as at the end of *The Philosophy of History*, that "in the Protestant World there is no sacred, no religious conscience in a state of separation from, or perhaps even hostility to, Secular Right," we hear the voice of Martin Niemöller, Vicar of Dahlem and U-Boat Captain, crying out in protest. The person who is related to God is the same person who is related to that organization of persons known as the State. That person cannot be rational if he subordinates God to the State, and that person cannot be divided.

Dr. Gustav E. Müller has done well in pointing out that Hegel does not always surrender the person to the State.⁴ In an essay on "The Scientific Treatments of Natural Right" (an early writing, it is true, from 1802) Hegel declares that "the morality of the individual is absolutely the real and therefore the

⁴In his *Hegel über Sittlichkeit und Geschichte* (München: Ernst Reinhardt, 1940), *passim*, esp. p. 100.

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

universal absolute morality; the morality of the individual is a pulse beat of the whole system and even is the whole system.”⁵ Had Hegel always remembered this utterance and stood by it, his philosophy could never have been distorted to serve as the ideological basis of the Nazi and the Communist states, as has been the case. Unfortunately, the mystical and irrational idea of a State as an entity superior to its members and superior to God has bedeviled psychologists, philosophers, and statesmen. It has furnished them with an instrument of emotional appeal which enables them to control persons, and induce them to abandon their autonomy, their conscience, and their devotion to reason in the interests of a blind and passionate patriotism. This is in sharp contrast to Hegel’s own idea of philosophy as an escape “from the weary strife of passions” into the realm of “the Idea of Freedom.”

Our conclusion, then, is that spirit is often taken to mean something superpersonal, some sort of Spirit of the Age, or of Uncle Sam, or of John Bull, or of the objects of Shinto worship; but that such objects are fictions, and unspiritual fictions. Devotion to a country is devotion to its true welfare, and specifically to a personal view of its welfare as enlightened

⁵ In the Lasson edition (1929) of Hegel’s Works, VII, 388.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

and strengthened by the personal views of the best men who have lived and are living in that country. The State consists of persons. Any view of the State which subordinates persons to an impersonal Spirit of the State or Age is unspiritual because it cuts the arteries of spiritual life. When the individual person is not made fundamental, then, to use Hegel's figure, the pulse no longer beats, and the State is not a living organism but a dead body. Thus an impersonal view of spirit is also an unspiritual view of it.

Let us summarize the resultant distinction between spirit and personality. Personality is the total life of consciousness, good, bad, indifferent; concerned with ends, means, or dreaming; rational, irrational, or neutral. Spirit refers to the ideal aspects of personality, and especially to the actual realization of a person's potential values. When we speak of spiritual values we are speaking of personality on its highest levels, or of the conflict between the good spirit and the evil spirit within man's personality. The spiritual life is Bunyan's "Holy War"—the only holy war for a Christian. It is the conflict within personality for the victory of good over evil, of unselfishness over selfishness, of truth and justice over compromise, of unrelenting endeavor over the weariness of the flesh. Thus the spiritual life in

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

human personality is, as we shall see more fully in a later chapter, a life that aspires to be Godlike. "If there were gods, how could I endure not being one?" asks Nietzsche. In so asking, Nietzsche is unspiritual, in so far as he here abandons the task of being his own best self in favor of being some other person; but, for all his extravagance, his cry is deeply spiritual, and is not unlike the stern "Be ye therefore perfect" of Jesus.

This conception of spirit ties it forever to personality, yet serves equally as a definition of the inexhaustible destiny of personality. For it is evident to the most casual observer that no human person is truly and wholly spirit. Man's sin, his low aim, his pride, and his despair, are ever-ready foes of the spirit. Yet to dwell overmuch on man's sinful state, as is the fashion in contemporary theology, and to denounce allegiance to the spirit as perfectionism, is to allow an honest and grim, but one-sided, realism about the present to become an enemy to effective devotion to the growing power of the spirit.

The spirit, we must grant, has many enemies among its friends. There are those who would absolve it from commitments and divert it from action to contemplation. There are those who would dwell so darkly on the sin of the human person as to cause

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

him to abandon hope of spiritual growth, while in the world but not of it. And there are other enemies within the camp of spirit. Any fanatical or one-sided devotion to a part of the spiritual life results in tensions that tear its seamless robe to shreds. Spiritual fanaticism is the most subtle foe to spirituality. Surely, we shall be told, the spiritual values are eternal, like the Platonic Ideas. Surely the spiritual life is loyalty to the eternal values. Surely we need not be concerned about what happens in time if only we are committed to eternal truth and beauty, goodness and love and justice. Yet even such commitments, because they overlook the personal nature of the spiritual, are in grave peril of undermining the life of the spirit. Only in personal soil can the spirit live; and persons live in time. Only in so far as the eternal Platonic Ideas are exemplified in the temporal occasions of personal life do those Ideas come to life as values. They are but signposts; and unless travelers go the way they point, signposts might as well be gravestones.

Let no devotee of the power of spirit belittle its ideal essence. Let no one anxious for cheap and quick results spurn the harder road of ideal discipline and rational labor. But it is equally important for the devotee of the ideal not to belittle the

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

incarnation of the ideal, its visibility in the flesh. The ideal that cannot assume personal reality is feeble and vain. The ought that is not obeyed is a general with no soldiers to command, an architect's plan with no contractor willing or able to build. Plato, right on so many things, was wrong in supposing that the exemplifications of the Ideas in the real world were but shadows on the wall of the cave. On the contrary, one ideal made real in personal life is worth all the unrealized ideals in the Platonic heaven, unless those ideals are what Whitehead takes the eternal objects to be—potentials for actual occasions.⁶ If there is an impotent spirit that can father no persons as its children, that spirit is no norm for real persons. Unless what ought to be really ought *to be* and to some extent *can be*, its ought is as empty a gesture as was ever made by a marionette.

II

In considering the differences between spirit and person we have already seen how closely the two are related. Yet in order to be perfectly clear, we should not only show that spirit is not identical with personality, but also emphasize more explicitly the dependence of spirit on personality.

⁶ See *Process and Reality* and *Adventures of Ideas*.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

Every sense in which spirit is used is related to personality. It is true that a personalist in metaphysics is of the opinion that all possible objects of every kind can be shown to be persons or selves, or aspects of persons, or in some way person-dependent. The personal nature of spirit, however, is clear without any abstract or subtle metaphysical speculations. We never speak of spirit without immediately implying personality in some sense. If we call a landscape or a painting spiritual, it is because we are thinking of its effect on the personality of the observer and perhaps also on the personality of its maker, whether a divine or human artist.

If we review what we have been saying about the distinctions between personality and spirit, we can now see how personal our idea of spirit is. A ghost or shade is the ghost or shade of a person. If spirit is life, it is the life of a person. If it be spirited passion, the passion of a person is meant. If spirit be intention or attitude, there is no impersonal intention or attitude; it is in the intention of a concrete person that spirit resides. If spirit means the good or evil, there can be no moral or spiritual good or evil except "in, of, and for a person," to quote the classic words of T. H. Green. Even the uncommitted contemplation of Santayana is a personal com-

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

mitment to a noncommitted life and can have no existence save in the conscious intuitions of a person. If spirit be immortal, personality must be immortal as its vehicle and carrier. The State is no spirit other than the spirits of the persons who constitute it; it is but the contribution of many persons to the trend of a society. If spirit be eternal ideals, those ideals are unspiritual and empty except in so far as they are or can be actualized in personal consciousness, and be the seeds of personal-social growth.

Spirit, therefore, is meaningless, a barren and unreal abstraction, apart from personality. As has been said, there is a noble ideal of impersonality in science, in the law courts, in loyalty to philosophical truth, and in religious devotion. But this impersonality is not in any sense a denial of personality or an indifference to its values. On the contrary, it is in essence a devotion to the cause of all persons. The ideal of impersonality is but a resolution to refuse to sacrifice any persons to narrow or unjust points of view, accompanied by a decision to serve the interests of all persons. The lover of truth is not a hater of persons; he is more like a prophet calling persons to their highest vocation and their most universal fulfillment. The ideal of impersonality is a foe, to be sure, of the present unspiritual state of persons

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

who themselves are suffering and causing others to suffer from their petty view of what a person is. There are doubtless cases of exaggerated devotion to the ideal of impersonality which tend to crush the development of other ideals such as those of sympathetic and helpful understanding of actual persons, but this only serves to show how dependent for its meaning and effectiveness the ideal of impersonality is on the particular personality of the one who entertains it.

If ever Emerson's cryptic words, "When me they fly, I am the wings," had application, it is in personal growth. The spiritual life is the life of a person striving toward the realization of his own highest ideals. Any attempt to escape the personal is itself an attempt by a person; and it is really an attempt to be a nobler and better person, unless it is a futile struggle to escape all existence. Even this last, as long as the person exists, is a personal goal and a personal striving. If the person perish and the dew-drop slip into the sea, then all meaning for both person and spirit has vanished into the unconscious.

III

The view that is being presented regarding the personal nature of spirit and spiritual goals rests on

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

a conception of which use has already been made, yet without sufficient definition. We have spoken of persons as potential spirits, and have defined persons as potential realizers of value. We have approved of Whitehead's definition of the eternal objects as potentials for actual occasions. There is no point in using a term without defining it. We may as well admit that potentiality is perhaps the most difficult term in all philosophy to define satisfactorily. It is as difficult to imagine and understand as is creation itself. But we must not identify the reality or importance of an idea with the ease of imagining it, or of thinking it. What, then, can be meant by speaking of personality as potential spirit?

We experience our own present consciousness directly, as well as being aware that it refers beyond itself to all sorts of other objects. Such present consciousness let us call the experienced situation, the datum self, or the experiment. Within the datum self one finds references beyond, such as memories, reasonings, sensations, hopes, aspirations, and the like. This present experience warrants one the belief that he is not the only experient. There are other conscious beings than himself. If there are not, it is impossible to account for the rise of ideas in experiences such as conversations, lectures, read-

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

ing of books, and the like. Other human beings are also conscious persons. But the same general considerations which make us acknowledge consciousness in human persons also lead us to acknowledge it in lower animals. Dogs, cats, pigs, horses, worms, and who knows what other animals, must be viewed as conscious. There are many degrees and levels of consciousness. To provide for these levels, we distinguish between selves and persons. We use the word self to designate any conscious experient, from amoeba to God. The least possible consciousness is a complex whole of experience which is worthy of being called a self, even if it is unable to enjoy any reflection upon its self-existence, or to guide itself by any ideal considerations. Every whole of consciousness is a self, and consciousness exists only as self. The continuity of a self is its thread of memories.

Every person, therefore, is a self. But not every self is a person. Those selves, and those only, that are capable of developing ideal values are worthy of being called persons. There are countless animal selves that seem to have no power of developing any ideals. They live for food and propagation only. Some subhuman selves manifest personal traits. The apes, as Wolfgang Koehler has shown, betray at least an elementary sense of justice; dogs are loyal; horses

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

are intelligent. Incipient personality appears below the human level. On the other hand, there are human selves—that is, selves born of human parents—so abnormal that, as far as we know, they can never develop any ideal values at all—certainly not in this life, perhaps not in the world to come. Such beings would be subpersonal selves, without eventual potentialities of any real development or redemption. Selves incapable of reflective and critical self-consciousness, unable to devote themselves to any ideal enterprise, are not persons. Persons are selves who are or will be able to develop ideal experiences of some kind.

We are now better able to see what is meant by saying that a person is a potential spirit. Yet the word potential remains a puzzle. If we ask ourselves what a potentiality is when it is not actualized, we easily become lost in blind alleys of thought, at least as long as we remain confined to the level of our own experience. When you and I try to think of our potentialities, we are never thinking of something definite that now is; we are thinking only of what under suitable conditions we can do, or of something we purpose to do. In fact, potentiality, so long as we remain on the level of present experience, can never be anything more than a problematic name for

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

whatever enables me to do what I can do. But no one supposes the universe to be exhausted in present experience. Potentiality, therefore, may be regarded as some aspect of the real not revealed in experience, so long as the potentiality is not actualized. For the philosopher of religion there is one specific way of thinking potentiality, suggested by Bowne, although rather vaguely. The possible, he hints, is in the sphere of freedom.⁷ Developing this hint, we may regard the potential as a field of choice made available to man by the purpose of God. This field of choice represents alternative directions in which the divine energizing may respond to the free selective choice of man. Thus the potentialities of a man may be regarded as that field of choice which the divine will makes available to him in view of the man's past experiences, present environment, and actual consciousness. The field of choice may be regarded as an assemblage of potentials, that is, of intentions on the part of divine will to respond at any point where human will makes a selection. This interpretation of potentiality in terms of a field of choice, which is close to Whitehead's theory of eternal objects, is a concrete view that does much to elevate potentiality from the realm of hocus-pocus.

⁷ *Theory of Thought and Knowledge*, p. 103.

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

This view may and should be criticized, and any criticism leading to a more enlightening view would be a real service. Thus far that particular service is in the realm of the merely potential, for this truth-seeker.

Spirit, then, is a field of force. It is in the form of potential energy for most of us most of the time. It is available, possible, but not actual. Spirit is never fully actualized in man. Ideal purposes are never fully in control of all consciousness. Few persons survey the field of possible spiritual forces sufficiently even to catch a glimpse of the available potentials of the spirit. The fact that consciousness is not matter is sometimes spoken of as its spiritual essence, but mere consciousness is not spirit unless ideal spiritual potentials are being actualized. The potential energies of our hidden powers must become kinetic energies before we can be called anything but slumbering spirits. "She is not dead, but sleepeth," says Jesus. There is, however, no practical distinction between perpetual sleep and death. Spiritual life is the conscious and purposive choice of man's personality to select and co-operate with some specific conscious and purposive energy of the divine mind. This very definition opens up perspectives for the development of spirit that point to

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

inexhaustible potentialities, inexhaustible energies, and inexhaustible actual growth. The nature of spirit is to require eternity.

IV

At least one further aspect of spirit in its relation to personality remains to be expressed. Thus far it has been established that spirit is a form of personal experience in the realization of its highest ideal potentialities. Our view of spirit should be made more concrete. We may, accordingly, express the concreteness of spirit by saying that spirit is a system of personal values.

Let us try to make this clearer by explaining what is meant by value. When we value anything, we like it; we prefer its presence to its absence. If we value it highly, we prefer its presence to the presence of many alternative values. If we value it supremely, we prefer to give up life itself rather than to live without life's supreme value. A valuation, then, is a liking or a preference. A value is the experienced fulfillment of our liking, the achieving of our desire. But life is not simple; our desires conflict. Values are mutually exclusive. The realization of one value excludes, sometimes excludes permanently, the realization of competing values. The good life is the life

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

which seeks such control of its values that no self-defeating values will be sought, and that only those values will be realized which are lasting, and which stand in rational and mutually helpful relations to each other. Mere desire, mere interest, can never of itself determine whether a value is worthy of being pursued. Hence we may call our primary desires value claims, and contrast them with the true values which are found in the life of lasting and rational value experience. The experiments of the race have taught it that the joys of work and play, of love and character, of truth and beauty and holiness, are lasting and rational values which constitute the ends of a truly worthy life. Every experience of friendship or of beauty or of knowledge or of reverence which enters into the building of a unified personality contributes to spiritual life. The life of value as a whole is the spiritual life.

It follows that no moment of life, by itself, is spiritual. No mere intention to do good is spiritual. No emotion, however ecstatic, is spiritual. That is, these are not spiritual, unless they are integral parts of a total life of value, promoting and generating other values, and thus yielding fruits of the spirit. A conversion experience modeled on that of St. Paul or of John Wesley is not spiritual because of its striking

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

psychological character nor because of its passionate fervor. It is spiritual only if it harmonizes with and promotes the spiritual life as a whole.

It may sound a bit repellent to say that spirit is a system of values. Yet this is really the very heart of spirit. We need to see system as something rich and concrete and living, not as a set of dry theories. You may, if you please, think of a system as a pure theory, and it is proper enough to use the word in that sense. There is a system of geometry, of logic, of mathematical physics, and of logarithms. But there is another kind of system, a system of real things. For instance, there is a railroad system—which recalls the old story about the passenger who asked the conductor whether he was traveling on the X, Y, and Z System, and the conductor who replied, “This is the X, Y, and Z Railroad, but it ain’t got no system.” Thus we can see that system is no barren abstraction; it is what makes life reliable, efficient, and productive. The railroad is a complex interaction between engines, coaches, rails, fuels, passengers, conductors, firemen, engineers, brakemen, porters, chefs, officials, and stockholders, not to mention Congress and legislatures. System is a concrete organization of the real. For another illustration let us think of a nervous system: a delicate ordering of cells and synapses,

SPIRIT AS PERSONAL

end organs and brain, stimuli and responses, habits and new adjustments, far more complicated than a railroad system, except that a railroad system involves as its parts the co-ordinations of many nervous systems. Every institution, whether a business organization, a university, a church, or a nation, is a system. If its parts are well-adjusted, thoughtfully related, and directed toward planned ends, the system is successful. All life aims at system. The failure of system is death—death of institutions, bodies, and souls. Spiritual life is the system of living realization of personal ideals.

At this point clarity requires an explanation of the relation between ideals and values. Ideals are concepts of what ought to be—railroad timetables, announcements of meetings, laws, projected activities. Ideals, then, are hopes, promises, plans. Ideals are means or instruments; they are not ends or intrinsic values, for such values are the fulfillment of the plans. The actual running of the trains on schedule, prompt and successful meetings, obedience to laws, the carrying out of planned activities—these are values. Hence the ideal of truth is no intrinsic value at all. It is merely the declaration that if you know truth, that knowledge will be a value. The ideal of moral law is no value. It is the command to

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

be moral plus the promise that if you are actually moral, and only if you are, you will experience moral value. Spiritual life, then, does not consist in some sort of ideal revel with abstractions. It is the stern business of obeying orders, the orders of our most thoughtful self, in the realm of actual living. Spiritual life is the task of the creation of personality by transforming its highest potentialities into actualities, its plans into execution, its hopes into reality.

Any thoughtful reader will be critical of this chapter. Whatever else he says, he will insist that the whole story has not been told. It is perhaps true, he will say, that spirit is personal; but he will add that to call it merely personal gives spirit too restricted and individual an accent. This criticism is thoroughly sound. Let the critic read further. If the insistence that spirit is personal were to mean that it is merely individual and subjective experience of value, then the view expressed in the present chapter would be superficial indeed. Hence the two succeeding chapters will undertake to supplement the present one. Chapter III will undertake to show that spiritual values are social as well as personal, that, in fact, they could not be personal without being social; and Chapter IV will aim to explain the objective source of spiritual ideals in the Divine.

CHAPTER III

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

Thus far we have been led to view spirit as a type of individual personal consciousness—namely, a consciousness that is powerful, noble, rich, free, and rational, as well as personal. Spirit, thus viewed, is a goal of personal striving, or an ideal of individual personality. The unspiritual is the narrow, the merely sensuous, the transient, the petty life. To be unspiritual requires no effort. There is a sense in which the spiritual life can be achieved by a mere effort of will. The popular expressions which we hear men use on the street, such as, "Snap out of it," or, "Be yourself," imply that the person, by a decisive choice, can transform himself according to his spiritual ideal instead of conforming to that particularly annoying part of the world which for the moment was depressing him and diverting him from his best self.

We have also seen, incidentally, that the course of the true spirit does not run wholly smooth. History

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

shows that there are tendencies toward the erratic and the wild in spiritual development. When men speak with tongues, sometimes they talk intelligibly in actual languages, but sometimes they squeak and gibber in no language at all. No one could have any idea what the squeaks mean. The experience of the Spirit led Montanists to extravagant claims about themselves; and not Montanists only, nor Anabaptists, but men of almost every generation of Christians who have yearned for spiritual experience have manifested tendencies toward the abnormal. Even in so profoundly rational a philosopher as Hegel we find full recognition of the place of the accidental, which offers problems to the spirit and produces many a tragic experience. There are "fightings without and fears within." "The hosts of sin are pressing hard." The spirit, then, is not safely entrenched in the inner life of the individual, obedient to the will, sure of immediate victory if only the individual be firm and loyal. The spirit in man must look beyond the personal will to those forces within and without that complicate and beset the life of the spirit. Prominent among those forces are the ones which come from our fellow beings and the social organization of life. Hence we turn to the consideration of spirit as social.

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

I

All that was said in the previous chapter remains true. Spirit is personal in the sense there explained. But to call it personal does not deny that it is also social. In fact, it cannot be personal without being social. The sharp separation between personal and social is artificial and unreal. All personal consciousness, and hence all spirit, is necessarily social. Let us examine this statement for a while.

Personal consciousness in man is certainly social in its origins. Every human being is the offspring of parents; his genetic relations to those two other persons is unavoidable. He carries their blood in his veins, and his personality is affected at every stage by those two parents of his; and not only by them, but by their parents and their parents' parents. Biologically, every man is the result of an unnumbered previous society. Further, and with equal certainty, all the persons with whom an individual comes into contact have some influence on him. Merely to see a person behave is for that behavior to enter into one's memory, and usually also into one's feeling as desire for imitation, or revulsion and abhorrence, or at least approval or disapproval. From birth, these social influences affect every person.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

If we lift our thought for the moment from the human level to the divine, and ask ourselves whether a divine consciousness is also necessarily social, we enter the realm of speculation. What an eternal consciousness must necessarily be is a topic to be discussed with caution and moderation. There is, however, one point that may be affirmed with certainty: namely, that if God is love, God is social. Love without society is frustrated and futile. Some have supposed that this consideration is evidence for the truth of the doctrine of the Trinity, but such argumentation is dubious. The richness of the divine activity which is symbolized in the doctrine of the Trinity should not be interpreted in such a way as to compromise the unity of the divine personality (or, as the ancient phrasing had it, the divine substance). Those who take the three persons in the light of a society within God are in grave danger of the dire heresy of tritheism, and are subject to additional criticism on the ground that a society of three members—even of three glorious and eternal members—hardly suffices to express the divine need of loving and being loved. Only an infinite society of persons could satisfy the need of infinite love, and the love of God must be infinite in the sense of being eternal and boundless. Not only is human conscious-

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

ness social, but divine consciousness also, in any sense in which it is at all worthy to be called divine, must therefore be eternally social; it is a concern for society, a need for companionship, a longing for response and co-operation. God, the ultimate origin of all lesser consciousness, is social. Society and social purposes enter into the eternal nature of the universe.

From another point of view, consciousness is social. Not only is consciousness largely produced by social means, but also it is largely directed toward social ends. Our knowledge to a great extent is knowledge either of other persons or of what they think or do or feel or wish us to think or do or feel about things. We hardly see anything or think anything with our own eyes or our own mind in a purely individual sense. And as our knowledge is mostly of others or of their conventions or wishes, so our action is directed toward others. We seek to influence others; we desire approval or challenge disapproval. We aim to bend others to our will or to submit to theirs. There is, of course, such an experience as sheer delight in nature without direct reference to society; but that delight is more delightful when shared, or when socially directed by a desire to contribute to the common stock of knowledge or of beauty or of

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

achievement. Even when the love of nature is an escape from society, even then it is a tribute to the haunting influence of the society which we are trying to escape. A state of consciousness that has no reference to society, direct or indirect, is so rare as hardly ever to occur; and when it occurs, it inevitably has social consequences.

Additional testimony to the social structure of the mind is found in the fact of communication. Much consciousness after early infancy takes place in the form of language. Mind has devised language for the purpose of communication, although communication is not confined to any verbal language. In addition to languages of speech, there are languages of gestures and signs—communications of thought and feeling without words. These means of communication have become essential to the understanding of the person by himself. Perhaps there is imageless thought, without even verbal images, but it is rare. In most thinking we talk to ourselves—silently for the most part—and thus derive the means of developing our individual personality from tools forged originally for social purposes. Without socially communicable and intelligible symbols of some sort the individual mind is helpless.

Carrying this thought a step further, we see that

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

our very self-consciousness has a social form. When I talk to myself, I view myself imaginatively as a society. It is not literally true, as some have thought, that the individual is many selves, or even two selves—an “I” and a “me”; but the individual is a single complex self and can assume a quasi-social attitude toward parts of himself. When we judge ourselves—praise, blame, estimate, challenge, approve, disapprove, like, or dislike ourselves and our conduct—the more objectively we view ourselves, the better we truly understand ourselves. That is, a man comes to real self-possession most profoundly when he is able to think of himself as if he were someone else; however, he should regard himself not as chairman, but as benevolent dictator of the “many selves” within him. Furthermore, every student of Hegel would wish to add that we must go much further; for no one can understand himself in his most private and individual recesses of thought and feeling without also understanding his relations to other persons. We cannot escape the social spirit wherever we turn. The present chapter will develop this thought.

What has been said must not be taken as meaning that all of man's experience is socially caused. Obviously much of our stream of consciousness is caused by influences from our nervous system and from the

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

stimulation of end organs by physical things without any human intervention. Yet after making full allowance for the causal activity of the nervous system and of physical things and processes, it remains true that experience however caused is socially significant. Furthermore, the physical in all of its aspects is a condition of social co-operation. If spirits were monads, each shut up within itself, imprisoned within the circle of its own ideas, then social communication and social co-operation would be precluded. Whatever the physical aspect of existence may be in its inner nature, the physical order serves not only as causal support of the conscious and spiritual, but also as means and condition of both communication and co-operation. While this fact is not of itself a conclusive argument for any particular type of metaphysics, it is plainly consistent with the ontology of those personalistic idealists who view all physical reality as being simply the consciousness of the Divine Person, energizing in one specific type of its experience. For such idealists physical nature is the continuous act of the divine *socius*, so that the whole universe is literally a society. Those who hold to this philosophy do not, of course, think that God's experience is exhausted in physical nature. The personality of God, they hold, includes vast areas of

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

truths and values and purposes unknown to us and countless types of experience unimagined by us, so far beyond the realm of physical nature that God's transcendence infinitely exceeds his immanence. Our phenomenal world is but a tiny island in the mind of God. This means, if it be true, that the Other whom we discover at work in nature is far richer and more worthful than nature could ever reveal it to be. Nature is but a fragmentary clue to other realms. These divine perspectives, pointing to Eternal Spirit as the friend of man, will be searched more closely in Chapter IV. At present we confine our thought to human consciousness.

II

Having seen that consciousness in all its phases, and therefore spiritual consciousness too, is social, it is important to guard against a one-sided emphasis by a reminder that spirit is nevertheless individual as well as social.

It is fairly obvious that society is the associating or relating of conscious beings to each others. Social experience presupposes associates. If the associates were nothing in themselves to start with and had nothing except what they gained from each other by their association, it is clear that they would always

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

be and have nothing. Zero plus zero, times zero, is zero. If no one has anything to give, no one can receive anything. Doubtless it is more blessed to give than to receive, but no one can give when he has nothing to give. St. Augustine asked: "What am I but what I have received?" If the good saint was speaking of his relation to God, the implied answer to his question is true of all his experience except the exercise of his will. If in an act of will he did not give to God something which he had not received, his relation to God was not on the personal plane. God willed, Augustine did not will! His words, then, are not wholly true of his relation to God; much less are they wholly true of human relations; for however much he or we may receive from other human beings, society could never develop unless each of us made some real contribution of his own, peculiar to himself. Unless spirit were genuinely individual, and individuality had a genuine content to impart to other individuals, social life would be empty, and no amount of social or physical relations would generate any experience or any values. This content of spiritual relations is nothing material; it is an experience of spiritual values. In his yearning for the spiritual, St. Paul cried, "Who shall deliver me from this body of death?" It is not St. Paul

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

alone who associates the body with death and the spirit with life. When we say, in ordinary language, "There comes a body down the street," we mean a dead body. But if we see a person coming and say, "What spirit he shows!" we mean that his body has become the vehicle of his inner life, and that his personality is imparting itself to others. Body without spirit is dead to others and might as well be biologically dead to itself. There can be no social life without inner, individual consciousness. The animating spirit is the source of society.

Persons are a curious mixture of individuality and sociality, of privacy and publicity. After all that we have said of the social, there is a real sense in which every experience of every individual is private. No matter how social or objective the cause or the reference of the experience may be, it is the individual's own consciousness. Just as no one else can experience the individual's private feelings exactly as he can, so no one can experience social relations in exactly the same way as anyone else does. And even if this could be done, each individual's experience of sociality would still be his own and not the other's, however like the other's it might be. We rightly say that we have social experience; we can refer to public meanings, and all reasonable minds will know

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

what we mean. In a sense, the world of physical things is open and common to all. But no amount of such commonness and publicity can annul the fact that every public experience is an experience of, by, and in a particular person. The so-called common-to-all is not an experience which is identically the same fact in all. It is not literally common. It is, rather, many private experiences, each numerically distinct from the other and each entertained by a person who believes that other persons understand what he means.

Commonness or publicity is, therefore, a matter of reference and belief, not a matter of immediate, actual experience. If anyone denies this statement, and asserts the contrary, he is either holding that his position is self-evident or else is adducing reasons for it. If he has to adduce reasons for it, it can hardly be an immediate certainty. The fact that many philosophers have denied it, notably Leibniz, is proof that it is not indubitably self-evident. It seems, then, that our most public and social experiences are rational beliefs entertained by individual persons rather than intuitive awareness of the presence of others or of common objects involving identical common experiences in each of the participants.

To sum up: No experience of any person is liter-

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

ally in itself social, common, public, or shared. Individuals, when they are having what we call social experience, are doing no more than entertaining a strong belief or faith that others experience as they do and mean what they mean. When this belief is supported by extensive evidence and rational thought, we may then call it social knowledge. But there is no point in saying, at any stage of knowledge, that your consciousness is mine in any literal respect at any time, or that we actually have in common so much as a single moment of social consciousness.

The spiritual importance of personal privacy may be illustrated by many instances of social experience. Sympathy derives its force from the fact that two distinct persons are involved. If the distinction of persons were to be broken down by a social experience in which the two persons were somehow merged into one, the whole meaning of sympathy would disappear and some complex form of egoism would result. In the experience of moral obligation and autonomy the importance of the distinction of persons is even clearer. Social relations are not moral unless each person involved entertains respect for the privacy of the other's personality and for the other's sense of duty as well as for his own; this fact comes to expression in intellectual understanding,

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

or what the Germans call *verstehende Psychologie*. Rational communication does not occur merely because a rational idea is socially presented; it occurs only when each person is assured that he understands the other. The need for this assurance presupposes the privacy of each participant.

In religious experience of a mystical sort the rule of privacy comes nearest to finding its exception. The soul seems to be lost in God. "The dewdrop slips into the shining sea." The problem of mystical experience is too large to discuss fully at this point; however, it may at least be pointed out that mystical experience in all its forms is compatible with the individuality of every personal consciousness. A mystical experience on this personalistic view would be one in which the attention and thought and feeling of the individual are so concentrated on God that he wholly forgets himself. But we should not infer from self-forgetfulness the nonexistence of self. To do so is contrary to ordinary experience. A reader frequently becomes so absorbed in a book that he forgets himself and his real life; but no one would be justified in inferring from this that he has, even in part, become the book or its contents. Whatever I experience, I must experience in my own person and not that of another, whether my experience is

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

directed toward my petty interests or eternal, divine values. The language of pantheistic mysticism, according to which the person is absorbed in God, is not realistic or true to spiritual development, Hindu mystics to the contrary notwithstanding.

III

We have shown that all consciousness is social in its origins and reference and communication; yet we have also shown that all consciousness is individual in the sense of being in, of, and for a person. We now face the question of the bearing of our results on spirit. In what special senses is spirit social, as distinguished from the more general respects in which all consciousness is social? Spirit is a definite kind of consciousness, the achieving of a specific goal. The goal of spirit is that kind of individual consciousness which is fitted to participate in an ideally worthy social order.

As such, spiritual life is something inherently communicable. William James in *The Varieties of Religious Experience* has made much of the ineffability of mysticism. Yet the mystical is in essence no more incommunicable than is any other experienced quality, such as the quality of redness or of sweetness or of pain. All that we can report about these quali-

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

ties consists of statements that will lead others to have experiences which we believe are similar to ours. It is noteworthy that the mystics in general are voluminous writers and talkers about their experiences, and that they have seemed to be able to lead others to have similar experiences. They communicate; their experience is contagious. In so far as the gift of tongues was the unintelligible muttering which St. Paul describes in First Corinthians, its spiritual value is extremely dubious, to the individual as well as to society. Regardless of its historicity, the account of the Pentecostal experience in Acts is a model of what spiritual experience ought to be: the ability to communicate truth and value to others in language which the others understand, "in our own tongue, wherein we were born." The more spiritual a man is, the better he can tell others what he means, and the more responsibility he feels to share his experience with others in this way. Friendship is a typically spiritual experience. Its expression does not always require words, and the words used need not be spoken with an Oxford or a Harvard accent. But if effective communication does not somehow take place, friendship lapses and withers and dies.

Another point is of great moment here. Spiritual

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

life is so lofty and so complex in its development that no solitary individual can make much progress in it. The art of spirituality must to a considerable extent be learned from others. The spiritual life is carried by a great tradition. It is too much for any one individual to create. All the values of spiritual tradition in art, in science, in philosophy, in literature, in institutions, and in religion are such as to be available to the spiritual man. This statement, of course, does not imply either the absolute authority or the coherence of any tradition; but it does mean that he who will not avail himself of the spiritual achievements of others in the past is poor indeed. The values of tradition for the spirit are sound evidence that the spirit is social.

As has been intimated, no tradition is fully satisfactory or complete. The spiritual life cannot be achieved by mere acquiescence. Spirit grows out of critical and creative search for the highest value. If this search is to have any prospects of success, it must be a common search. Only the unspiritual egotist could suppose that he alone, in revolt and solitude, could reach the goal of the spirit. The inexhaustible search for the realization of that goal requires co-operative exploration. There may, of course, be overemphasis on the social aspect, par-

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

ticularly if the social is misconceived as the process of doing something for someone else without his responsible co-operation. An infant that is never allowed to do anything for itself can hardly be expected to grow into spiritual maturity. The spiritual search of which we are thinking is not social in this mechanical and paternalistic sense. It is social in the sense of being co-operative exploration of spiritual possibilities. The writer of the Book of Revelation, when he was in the spirit on the Lord's Day, was led to contemplate the whole destiny of human society. When he wished to speak spiritually of Jerusalem, he called it "Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified." He related the sins of Jerusalem to all the sins of past history. Spirit is the social discovery of social values and social judgments.

Tolstoy, in writing of art, tells us that it must be infectious. A pretended work of art which does not stir others than the artist is no true art at all. We may transfer Tolstoy's conception to the total life of spirit. One of the most characteristic marks of spirit is its contagiousness. Truth arouses curiosity, art evokes admiration, goodness stirs others to imitate or to oppose it, and religion in any individual leads others to worship the same God or to seek a better. Not that spirit universally achieves social results,

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

for many of its highest manifestations remain relatively uninfluential in society and even repel the unspiritual masses. However, if a so-called spiritual experience called forth no response in anyone else, if it were repellent instead of infectious in its effects on everyone, then its spiritual character would be seriously in question.

It is a striking fact that all of these social attributes of spirit have as their chief effect the development of strong, vigorous individualism. The spiritual man, according to St. Paul, is one who has put on "the whole armour of God." He is an individual aggressive for God and aggressive against evil. His individualism is socially directed, but it is individualism. The spiritual man is a strong man, equipped with the Sword of the Spirit. Perhaps Nietzsche was not unspiritual when he described his Superman as Caesar with the soul of Christ; nor the Revelator, when he declared that the name of him that sat upon the horse is called "The Word of God."

IV

There is a special aspect of the social nature of spirit which requires examination. The philosopher Hegel has called attention to it. When he speaks of Objective Spirit, he means (as we saw in Chapter II)

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

spiritual life expressed in social institutions. When we read Hegel, we gain the impression that he thinks of the spirit of an institution as being an additional reality above and beyond the individuals who constitute it. The nation is "the bearer of the current phase in the development of the world-spirit." A similar idea, in the form of a theory of the social mind, has influenced many other philosophers and psychologists, particularly J. M. Baldwin and Josiah Royce. In so far as a literal social mind is referred to, it should be rejected as myth and fiction. Not only is it an unnecessary hypothesis in view of the fact that the whole meaning of the institution consists of the interrelations of the persons who carry it on, but also it is a dangerous hypothesis in that it leads to a fatalistic surrender of the responsibility of the individual to the mythical supermind. Even Hegel grants that "at the summit of all actions, including world-historical actions, stand individuals." But the rejection of a false theory of group spirit does not justify us in overlooking the importance of group life for spiritual development. Let us, then, interpret Hegel's Objective Spirit as meaning the spiritual purposes of individuals directed toward and affected by the common spiritual ends and experiences of a special group. The *Zeitgeist*, the spirit of

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

the age, is not a hovering ghost of some kind, haunting and compelling us, its slaves; it is only a name for the way most of us feel and act.¹

Assuming this view of the Objective Spirit, let us examine a few typical group phenomena with reference to their spiritual nature. The fundamental group in society is the family. It is obvious that to a considerable extent the family is nonspiritual. The child's existence is a natural fact, not of his own choosing. It is his fate to be born without being consulted. Like the biological, the economic basis of the family is also unspiritual, in so far as it is brute fact. The presence or absence of economic goods is not intrinsically spiritual. Yet it would be far from realistic to infer that the biological and the economic bases of family life are irrelevant to spirit merely because they are unspiritual. The spirit is a plant that grows in the soil of earth, and the nonspiritual soil both sets limits and also affords powers to the spirit. The body and material goods may be obstacles, or may be instruments, for the development of spirit. This principle is especially well illustrated in the family, because in it the mixture and conflict of spiritual with unspiritual are so evident in daily experience. The economic is important, but it is im-

¹ For a further treatment, see the end of Chapter VI.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

portant only because of its effect on conscious spirit. This is what Karl Marx really meant, especially in his and Engels' passionate plea in *The Manifesto of the Communist Party* for the restoration of the dignity of personality which had been violated by a greedy economic system. But Marx in his protest overreached himself and frequently spoke of consciousness as being no more than the reflection of the economic order. The fact is that in every family consciousness is more than economic. No real family is entirely dependent on its economic welfare. The extremes of poverty and wealth are both challenges to the family spirit; in many families spirit dies under the first assault of unfavorable economic circumstances, but in many others changing economic conditions develop unsuspected courage, generosity, and creative imagination.

Whatever unspiritual aspects there may be in the materialistic basis of the family, it remains true that the family is more than materialistic. It is a natural and nonvoluntary institution in part, but in larger part it is spiritual and voluntary. A family that co-operates in work and play, in planning and carrying out plans, is an Objective Spirit. In so far as a family strives for common spiritual values with due respect to the variety of personalities in the family,

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

it is a fundamental unit of the social spirit. The extent to which a family achieves the spiritual goal will to a large extent depend on its view of the natural. If physical life is regarded as essentially unspiritual and its manifestations are tolerated as necessary evils, whether in the relations of husband and wife or in the larger attitude toward physical joys and the use of material things, a spiritual life can be attained, but it will always be something more or less ascetic and harsh. But if the material is regarded as itself a form of the spiritual, an expression of the very life of Divine Spirit to man's spirit, then the spiritual will be seen to include and glorify the natural. Physical relations and material processes and things will be seen as parts of what A. A. Bowman has rightly called a Sacramental Universe.

The evil of materialism, whether in family relations or in a whole culture, does not lie in the use of material things; it lies in our understanding and interpretation of material things. If the material is treated as an end in itself, then its relation to God's will and plan for men is obscured. Materialism lies in a false philosophy of matter, one that enslaves and debases man. But the spiritual use of matter is not materialism. When a family spontaneously and wholeheartedly accepts all material things as God's

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

gifts and as forms of God's co-operative working, then the understanding, appreciation, and use of the material is a movement of the spirit toward God. How much better it is to see matter as the very presence of God with us in his actual will and energy than to fall into the error of the cultist who regards matter as error of mortal mind. Matter is no error. It is a part of the truth of Divine Mind, and every scientist who studies matter is exploring the thought and will of God. Error lies in the misinterpretation or misuse of matter. No family could be built on the material manifestations of God alone, without regard to his higher manifestations of ideal truth and love; but no family can come to fullest spiritual development in which the natural is rejected as unspiritual or erroneous. Fortunately many homes in which a false theory is held find happiness because the members of the family act as if material things really were good gifts of the good God, spiritually profitable if rightly used.

The ascetic attitude toward matter, traditionally supposed to manifest a higher level of spirituality, has called men and women away from the toils and joys of family life to religious communities. It may be that certain virtues are more readily developed in monasteries and convents than in the family. Be

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

that as it may, virtues which depend on the abandonment of the highest task that God has entrusted to man are purchased at too high a cost. It is more spiritual to abandon the ascetic for the personalistic view of matter, and to see in the shaping of the material possibilities and resources of a family a genuinely religious experience, than it is to surrender the family at the behest of "evil" matter.

If we turn from a consideration of the family to other examples of Objective Spirit, we find the same principles at work on a larger scale. The nation, like the family, is a combination of the nonspiritual with the spiritual. The nonspiritual factors are far more complex; racial, geographical, and economic inequalities introduce incalculable complications into the life of almost every nation, but especially of America. The natural resources of America, which are reservoirs of wealth, are also arsenals of destruction and objects of greed and contention. The spiritualizing of a nation is manifestly a far more onerous task than the spiritualizing of a family. Those who enter a nation's domain must first be naturalized before they are spiritualized. Unfortunately the process of Americanizing our naturalized citizens is often very far from a process of spiritualizing. In fact, so-called Americanization

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

may uproot old spiritual traditions and cultures and substitute for them no more than hollow slogans and outer trappings of democracy. If there is not an inner and spiritual experience of the true aims of a nation in its most ideal aspirations, quite regardless of what the form of government may be, naturalization is doomed to spiritual failure. Only the spiritual nation is truly real; only it is the living purpose and growth of a people. To substitute sentimental for real spirituality is to render the Objective Spirit feeble and shallow. The spiritual life is deeply emotional, it is true; but the spirit is stirred by emotion in the service of noble ideals and is fully aware of its lofty task of making ideals real. If a nation is swept along by emotions that it has not tested and does not understand, it is in grave peril. When the spiritual life fails to stir man's emotions to appropriate action, it is in ever graver peril. The high task of the Objective Spirit is the development of a spiritual nation in a spiritual society of nations. Unless this aim be kept in mind and made dominant, no nation or League of Nations can fulfill its proper destiny.

Precisely the same problem with the same type of solution is to be found in the church, another example of Objective Spirit. As an ecclesiastical organization with economic and political affiliations

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

the church is not purely spiritual, by any means. In fact, the church's constant need for funds, her endowments, the power of influential individuals, clerical and lay, to ruin the career of anyone whose views are not acceptable, demands for sound business policy, obligations felt by a married clergy to have an eye out for the material welfare of the minister's family—these are often grossly unspiritual forces. It must be granted that the temptations in the natural order for a church to forsake its spiritual mission are most potent. Add to this the fact that the church's chief problem is not that of dealing with the sinful world, but rather that of persuading its members to behave in a tolerably Christian manner toward each other, and you have what to the natural man would seem to be an impossible task. Yet St. Paul, despite his well-known troubles with the church in Corinth and its immoral conduct, ventured to call the church "the body of Christ."

As there is a natural family and a spiritual family, as there is a natural nation and a spiritual nation, so there is a natural church and a spiritual church. The spiritual church, usually called the church invisible, consists of all the members of the church in so far as they are co-operating through the church for Christian ends. The spiritual church is never

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

fully realized; but it, like the spiritual family, does not stand in sharp contrast to the natural. Actual human beings, their souls and bodies, their wealth and poverty, their hopes and fears, are the natural material of the church. The church invisible is made of exactly the same material. It is not some ghostly choir or band of angels whose home is in the Celestial City. No, it is the spirit which controls and animates men and women living in actual earthly cities, which need not be like the City of Destruction unless we will them to be. The spiritual church, then, is not severed entirely from the world; it is in the world, though not of it. A church which conceives its mission as that of providing escape from the terrible facts of our contemporary world has failed in its spiritual mission. Those who wish to set the church off in a separate realm may say, "Let the Church be the Church." Those who wish to see it working at its task will forget aristocratic separatism, and will say, "Let the Church be Christian."

The spirit of man today is much like the valley of dry bones in Ezekiel's vision. God asks the church today, "Son of man, can these bones live?" And the church answers, "O Lord God, thou knowest." God replies, "Prophesy upon these bones. . . . Thus saith the Lord God unto these bones, Behold, I will

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

cause breath to enter into you, and ye shall live." The church today knows well enough that the rattle of musketry and artillery is but the rattle of dry bones. The task of the church is not to flee from the ghastly sight of a devastated world into darkened cloisters of mysticism or ecclesiasticism, but rather to find the sources of spiritual power that will bring life into the bones. No ascetic family, no spiritually isolated nation, no other-worldly church, but a family, a nation, and a church that can breathe into bones and dust the breath of life—this is the Objective Spirit that we need today, the transforming power of spirit in civilization.

The church, with all her materialistic weaknesses and temptations, stands in a unique position in the world, as the only actual supernatural force that reaches over battle lines and boundaries in the interests of peace and justice. The spiritual church stands, therefore, as a symbol of the World Spirit that Hegel dreamed of. The World Spirit needs both a soul and a body. Hence the social task of spirit will remain incomplete until there is some sort of world-wide co-operation in a genuine League of Nations, in which all ideas of aggression and conquest are abandoned, and in which labor will be justly rewarded, sickness and old age provided for,

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

because motives of sharing and mutual helpfulness take the place of personal greed. No consideration of the technical difficulties involved in this dream, and no realism about the sinfulness of human nature and the blackness of the present, can ever justify man in ceasing to dream the dream of a spiritual world order, and to labor for its realization.

When one takes a long view of world history, the material triumphs of the past vanish in comparison with its spiritual triumphs. The noblest architectural and artistic remains that have survived from Greece and Rome, Babylonia and Egypt and Persia, are almost pitiful wrecks in comparison with the vivid and living power of the spiritual ideas transmitted to us by the thinkers, poets, and prophets of those lands. The temple no longer stands in Jerusalem; one temple after another was destroyed by the enemies of Israel; but the Book remains, and the spirit of Israel is unbroken. Material achievements are weak and impermanent when compared with spirit. If the economic greatness of contemporary America is almost forgotten, her greatest songs will still be sung, her ideals of democracy rehearsed, her scientific and philosophical and religious insights built into the new world that will be.

There always will be aspects of life that are tran-

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

sient, abstract, nonvoluntary, and intolerant. But these will pass. The group spirit, the Objective Spirit, lives and thrives on the permanent values of life, the concrete organization of experience, voluntary control of natural powers and resources, and the aspiration for a co-operative order.

V

Spirit we have seen to be social. It must be social because all consciousness is social, yet it is social in a sense that is consistent with its existence in individuals whose experience in one real sense is wholly private. In being social it is communicated from man to man, is passed down the ages by tradition, is critical, creative, and contagious, and yet in its very social processes develops and is sustained by strong individualism. We have just seen how spirit is manifested in the group in the types of organization that Hegel called Objective Spirit, yet without involving any mythical social mind or any existence other than that of the individuals who share and communicate social experiences.

In bringing our thought on the social structure of spirit to its close, it is fitting to dwell for a few moments on the theme of the unity of personal spirit. The actual social scene is not pervaded by unity.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

Such temporary unities as a nation finds in times of national crisis dissolve when the crisis passes, only to emphasize the disunities all the more sharply. The social life of man, as well as his individual life, is well described by Bosanquet as being a "world of claims and counterclaims." Body makes claims and soul makes counterclaims. Desires and instincts are a welter of conflicting urges. Intuition, in which some seek for ultimate certainty, yields Nazism, Shinto, and sundry other incantations. Groups within each nation regard each other as natural enemies and hardly suspend their hostilities in the face of international war.

Face to face with all this chaos stands man's true spirit, his social reason. Although every individual is a battleground of conflicting forces, he is one person, and, as one person, feels most deeply the need for unity. If in all his relations he is not one in purpose and fundamental thought, he is destroying himself. Man's wildest outrages are forms of his search for unity; he is always seeking means—however self-defeating and irrational—of crushing the sources of conflict in order that he may possess his soul in peace. But this method, the method of violent eradication of every supposed foe, is hostile to another aspect of the need for unity. It is not a

SPIRIT AS SOCIAL

barren oneness that the spirit needs, but a rich and concrete unity. Hence, in the world of claims and counterclaims, no spiritual solution is found until every claim has been heard and judged in the light of the social spirit as a whole. No yearning of spirit is to be treated lightly or violently.

Thus above the conflict of claims and counterclaims within us is the wholeness of personality; each man is a complex unity, what William Stern called *unitas multiplex*. From this point of view, humanism emerges on its most elementary level. Man is the measure of his own needs and conflicts. But there are many men; and after each one has found his own unity, he is all the more conscious of the disunity of his aims with the aims of many others. Above the individual, therefore, is the nation, its "soil and blood," as the Nazis have it, or, in the loftier conception of Socrates, its laws and institutions. Yet no nation can stand alone, self-sufficient in its culture and purposes. Every nation needs every other nation, for free trade and reciprocity both material and spiritual. Above all nations is humanity.

Is humanity the highest goal of spirit? Shall we stop with Comte and the positivistic humanists? No; humanity does not exist in a vacuum. Its values are

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

not a creation from nothing by man the almighty. Man's spirit knows that it is dependent on something else for its existence and its worth. When we think of man's body and of man's mind as dependent on his body, we call that something else by the name of nature. But when we think of man's spirit, and of spirit as mastering nature, we see that nature is an inadequate name for the source of spirit. Man's highest social thought is not humanity, or nature, but God. No longer can we say that man is the measure; or, with Dewey, that nature is the measure; but, as Plato said in the *Laws*, that God is the measure of all things. Man the individual and man the society can measure himself only when he thinks the highest thought he is able to think, the thought of God. Before God's judgment bar the claims and counterclaims of the world are adjudicated.

The meaning and possibilities of spirit have not been exhausted in our thought thus far. It is not enough to think of spirit as conscious, and personal, and social. As we have been led to see, we must face what is meant by Divine Spirit, and the search of the human spirit for its home and Father in an imperishable and eternal Spiritual Source. In the coming chapter we shall face the problem of "Spirit as Divine."

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

The method thus far pursued in our investigation of spirit has been an empirical one. To call it empirical is not to say that it is like Hume's method. Far from it! Instead of concentrating on sense impressions, a fully empirical inquiry into spirit must survey the whole range of personal and social experience, with special emphasis on ideal values and their place in the whole scheme of experience. Furthermore, to call a method empirical does not doom it to a perpetual tarrying with the investigator's own present experience. The genuine empiricist will ask: What does this experience of mine, all of it, really mean? What does it lead to? What is it a sign of, beyond itself?

Up to the present chapter, many empirical traits of spirit have been discovered, especially its power, its personal character, and its social aspects. These are human experiences of spirit. They are found in man and belong to his very being. They ennoble

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

him, and raise him, not only above the beasts, but also above the unspiritual levels of his own natural existence. There can be no doubt that there is a spiritual impulse at work in man striving toward a nobler, richer life. It appears in the most unexpected and unfavorable circumstances—in prisons, on the sickbed, in the harsh competition of business, in war, in persecution, and in unpopularity. There is a holy spirit in man, as a plain matter of fact. Is this holy spirit in man a sign of the real existence of a Holy Spirit beyond man?

There are many who deny that there is a Holy Spirit in the universe. The world-shaking events of modern times have shaken the very souls of men. But instead of shaking souls into action, events seem to have stunned many souls, and left them without hope and without faith. Many have sunk into lethargy and indifference to all spiritual ideals. The state of these persons is the greatest spiritual and social peril to democracy that exists—more perilous than cannon, planes, or tanks, and more perilous than frank and energetic opposition to spiritual ideals. The most deadly Fifth Column is that of the Demonic Leader, I Don't Care.

Those who thoughtfully and deliberately deny that there is a Holy Spirit as a Cosmic Friend are

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

themselves friends of God without knowing it, for they are considerate enough to pay attention to him. These unconscious allies of the Holy Spirit who deny the very existence of their ally are worthy of serious consideration. Let us take as an example a book review published in the *New York Herald-Tribune Books* for April 13, 1941. The reviewer was H. M. Parshley. The book reviewed was Julian Huxley's *Man Stands Alone*. Mr. Parshley quotes Mr. Huxley as saying that scientific humanism is "a protest against supernaturalism; the human spirit, now in its individual, now in its corporate aspects, is the source of all values and the highest reality we know." Mr. Parshley (writing for a leading capitalist newspaper) is naturally pleased to find something that he regards as "more solid ground" than "the ideals of the Socialized State," although it is far from clear why the denial of God and the assertion that there is nothing better than man in the universe should be solid ground for anything in particular, or what connection the denial of God has with the denial of the Socialized State in Mr. Parshley's mind. But Mr. Parshley has more and better surprises in store for his readers. He goes on to say that Huxley's assertion is "some degree of protection against the irrational assaults of current events." This seems con-

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

fused and confusing in the extreme. Yet back of it all one can see in Mr. Huxley and Mr. Parshley at least one profound conviction. Man really somehow reveals the best in the universe; there is nothing nobler and better than spirit at its best; and man's spirit is worthy of devotion no matter what foes may attack it. It is this faith in the spirit that is the backbone of humanism. Such faith is not to be despised. It is incomparably higher in the scale than the theistic faith of the weary Christian who passes by on the other side, or of the metaphysical speculator who views the fate of men with a cool indifference that is supposed to become lofty and elevated when it is called "objectivity."

What one cannot grasp, however, in the claims of such antitheistic humanism is the boast that it is in some special sense scientific and rational. It is scientific to observe facts and formulate and test hypotheses about them; but it is not scientific, in any sense known to physics or biology, to pass judgment and say that one being is higher or better than another. It is certainly rational, even if not "scientific," to have a theory of value. That is to say, the thinker who experiences values finds himself obliged to choose, and to choose on rational grounds, from among the possibilities of value which he finds in his

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

experience. None of the recognized sciences, however, gives him any principle of choice, except one. Physics, chemistry, astronomy, physiology, biology, psychology, sociology, anthropology—these all pile up data but define no standards, no goals for human action. No science can guide us—except one, we said. That one is the science of ethics—ethics, and the associated sciences of value. Yet ethics is precisely the science that is not meant when one speaks of scientific humanism. Humanists practice moral ideals, of course, but the science of morals is a serious difficulty to them. Its principles of obligation, of value, of right, of ideals, are principles which have no legitimate place in a naturalistic universe, if the naturalistic universe is exactly as it is defined by the basic physicochemical sciences. On the other hand, if the universe is also as it is defined by the sciences of value, then it is what ethics and aesthetics, logic and philosophy of religion find it to be. In the light of these facts, there is no plain sailing for those who declare that man “is the source of all values and the highest reality that we know.”

If the sciences of value teach us anything, it is that ethical, logical, aesthetic, and religious norms are not arbitrary human inventions, but are rational principles in harmony with the nature of things.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

The good, the true, the beautiful, and the holy all deal with man's relations to aspects of reality on which he is dependent and which his will does not produce. If man's will produces his character, it does not produce the conditions which make character possible. Humanism, then, must give up its claim that man is the highest reality we know, or else give up its allegiance to ideals and values which are grounded in the realities of experience which are beyond human control. To refuse to examine the relations of man's values to the rest of the world may be convenient for some purposes, but not for the purposes of protection against the irrational. Things have become very ironic if the only protection against the irrational is the refusal to think rationally! Of course, the refusal to try to understand man's place in the cosmos is a guarantee that man will be freed from making any positive errors in his thought about the real. Where one does not try, one does not fail. Where one does not think, one commits no fallacy. But there is no clear reason why the refusal to examine the objective origins and objective reference of human values should be regarded as an advanced stage of thought. It is a retreat, a rout, a panic. In panic there may be some escape from an immediate peril, but there can be no

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

“intellectual salvation,” or salvation of any other kind.

Without being deterred by the humanistic veto, let us see what happens if we try to think about the objective source of man's spirit. The utmost that a humanist can say is that the only objective source and condition of spirit is an unspiritual nature which man's spirit can use. But is it not more reasonable to seek for a spiritual source of spirit—a Divine Spirit?

I

The starting point of all thought is ourselves. No matter what we are thinking about, it is we who are doing the thinking. No matter what lofty words we utter—Science, Objectivity, Eternity, Validity, Essence, or God—they are our human words after all. So too our more trivial words are human—words for food and drink, for sleep and work, for things in the world around us. No theory of philosophy, religion, or common sense can upset the plain fact that all human experience is human, and specifically that all my experience is mine, and your experience yours. This fact, which seems unworthy of notice to some, seems to others to be the last word. The judicious grieve both at contempt for any fact and also at

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

sticking in any fact without trying to see where it leads, but the grief even of the judicious is profitless unless accompanied by insight.

Let us seek, then, to examine the point of view which declares that because the spiritual life is human it is exclusively human. This point of view is called by many names; humanism, agnosticism, positivism, and subjectivism are samples. Perhaps the last named is as good as any for our purposes. What, then, do those thinkers have in mind who tell us that spiritual values are purely subjective?

It is easy enough to show that the word subjective is a slippery one. Our experience of everything objective is subjective in the sense of being present in and to our consciousness. Furthermore, everything subjective—sensations, thoughts, feelings, or the ego-subject itself (as some view it)—may be referred to as an object of thought. It thus appears that everything objective is subjective and everything subjective is objective and we are going around in the circles for which philosophy is justly famous.¹

Let subjectivity and objectivity be as slippery as you please. It is still true that there is a difference between what is now present in a person's conscious-

¹ See John Dewey, "The Objectivism-Subjectivism of Modern Philosophy," in *Jour. Phil.*, 38(1941), 533-42.

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

ness and what is not. We must add that so far as actual experience is concerned, everything real is given only in the form of subjectivity; in other words, everything that we can say about anything whatever is no more or less than an interpretation of our own actual conscious experience. If this be true, it is obvious that the spiritual life is in a sense subjective.

Spirit is subjective because it is personal consciousness, but those who say that spirit is purely subjective have a more specific meaning in mind than this. They do not mean merely that spiritual values are consciously experienced by man. They mean that in the nature of the case, values are inherently subjective and can exist only in consciousness. Were we not led to this position in Chapter II, in dealing with spirit as personal? And is it not a truth? To the unsophisticated man it seems plain enough that some of our experiences refer to states of affairs that are what they are whether anyone is conscious or not. Suppose we feel sure that Mount Everest is in the Himalayas. No one in his senses would say that Mount Everest consists of our feeling of assurance and that it is there only when we feel sure about it. If every human being were to be destroyed in the suicidal wars of our human but inhumane race, Mount Everest would still be there. No one would

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

try to climb it. No one would call it Mount Everest. There would be no one to do climbing or calling. Nevertheless, the mountain would stand there in blissful indifference to our disappearance.

The value subjectivist would agree with us in all this and would add that it is fuel for his fire. He blazes forth with the answer: Yes, that is just my point. Values lack the traits which guarantee objectivity. We know Mount Everest through our senses, or, if we can reach India, we can do so. At least we can trust the reports of others about their sense observations. Whereas, values are mere emotions, not accessible to our senses. Furthermore, it is unthinkable that any value should exist anywhere or anyhow save in and for a personal consciousness.

Take love as an example of spiritual value. It has its being in the hearts of those who love and are loved; we say hearts, but we mean conscious experience. Love is no state of the cardiac organ, although that organ may beat wildly as a result of love; but love is what a person feels, thinks, hopes, plans, dreams, and wills toward another person, or a group, a nation, a race, or a whole humanity of persons. Try to conceive what love would be when no one is conscious of it. The abstract Platonic Idea of love is a sorry substitute for the real thing. There may

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

be something in the universe which promises that love can never be killed; but if there is, that promise is unfulfilled whenever there is no actual conscious experience of love.

For another example, let us take the spiritual value of beauty, the beauty of music, for instance. Music, we say, may be bought in stores, printed on sheets. Yet sheet music and portfolios are not music. Only when someone is able to translate the signs on paper into audible or imagined sounds, present to some person's conscious experience, does the music exist as a spiritual value. The presence or the conscious memory or the conscious traces of such experience together constitute the value and the reality of music. The deaf man may have music in his soul. The man with hearing has no music in him if it does not exist as a vivid reality in his soul.

Let us take one more example. Spiritual men everywhere value truth. Whether it brings pleasure or pain, it is good to know the truth. There is a joy, sometimes a solemn joy, in sheer knowledge, even knowledge of evil. That we can know is good, even when what we know is tragic. Now we often think of truth as objective, and more objective than love or music. Is it not true that Mount Everest is there

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

whether any man knows it or not? We often quote Arthur Hugh Clough's lines:

‘ It fortifies my soul to know
That, though I perish, truth is so.

Yet it is a delicate question what truth is when no one knows it. In a sense, of course, facts are facts and things are what they are, whether anyone knows them or not. If we wish, we may give the name of truth to the fact that things are what they are even when they are unknown to every mind in the universe; yet such a truth as that is of no value whatever. It is unknown and unappreciated. Truth as value is known truth. Truth unknown to anyone is valueless as long as it is unknown. If it is true that there is an unconscious universe somewhere with masses of gorgeous coloring, graceful lines, and musical sounds, then the gorgeousness and the grace and the music are additions which we make when we think of what such a universe would be if someone could experience it. Indeed, color, lines, and sound also depend on the experiencing mind. So, too, to say that it is true that there is such an unconscious universe means that someone would value the consciousness of it if he only could acquire that consciousness. But if it is true that such a universe exists and no one

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

knows that truth, then such a truth is utterly unspiritual and valueless. The value of truth consists in its being known and valued by a conscious being.

The subjectivist, therefore, has a good case. He is able to show that all value, even the value of truth (and even more clearly of goodness and of worship), consists in conscious experience by conscious subjects. The subjectivist may go further. He may rightly urge that no value which I experience can have any existence anywhere except in my experience. My values are in my mind and only there. They do not float in some Platonic ether. My joys, my hopes, my thoughts, my loves, my appreciations—these are all my experiences; and to speak of love as having any objective existence other than in experience is to talk a kind of glorified nonsense, of which we have had about enough in philosophy, religion, and sentimental life. Even the value of a truth can exist only in and for the mind that values it. A person may, indeed, know that other persons value the same sort of experience that he values, but his own values can be real only in his own experience. Has the subjectivist, accordingly, demonstrated his case? No, he has overlooked a vital point, which has also been overlooked by many of his critics.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

The vital point is that values embody something universal. Whenever a person experiences a value which he judges to be a true value—one that stands the test of time, of consequences, of rational criticism—he does so because he has tested that value, or value claim as we may call it, by the ideal of rational coherence. The ideal of coherence means logical consistency, systematic and related thought, and inclusiveness. When a value can take its place in a coherent system, then we treat it as a true value, just as we treat a scientific or philosophical hypothesis as true for the same reason: namely, that the conditions of coherence are fulfilled. Without meeting those conditions, our very sensations are a mere subjective chaos. The value experience, like primary sensation, then, is to be distinguished from the ideal by which it is tested. The great ideal under which all truth about value as well as facts must fall is, as we have said, the ideal of coherence, which is the norm of norms by which all human claims are tested. Applying this ideal, we discover that there are various types of value experience, such as the good, the true, the beautiful, and the holy; and we find that there are coherent norms which we can develop as ideals for judging our experiences in each of these spheres.

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

To these ideals good men in all civilizations have been devoted.

The first stage of proper answer to the subjectivist is now at hand. Yes, we may say to him, values are personal; they are subjective; they exist only in the mind that feels them. Nevertheless, they are tested by standards which are universal, and are true for all minds. The laws of coherent reason are acknowledged by every mind that is a mind. No thinking being can deny that truth must be consistent, that all the available facts must be considered if the whole truth is to be found, and that order and system lead to truth as disorder and chaos do not. Music as a value is subjective; but ideals of musical harmony are laws, largely mathematical, which are objective and common to all minds that seriously investigate the subject of music. If ideals are not objective and, indeed, the basis of all objectivity, then there is no meaning to objectivity at all except a groundless claim. We can say that Mount Everest is there only if we can trust the laws of reason in the interpretation of that series of our experiences which refer to the mountain. Physics rests on the objective validity of certain ideals of experiment and of critical thought. The subjective value can preserve its status as value in a mind only by submitting to an objective

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

test—the test of ideals: for a mind that does not govern itself by ideals has ceased to fulfill its destiny as a mind.

II

Thus we are driven from the position of the subjectivist to an appeal to objective ideals. Traditionally men have spoken of the objectivity of values as the basis of faith in a Holy Spirit. We have found that we were inaccurate in that expression, and that we should do better to speak of the objectivity of ideals. Let us see exactly what that means.

It is important to distinguish ideals from values. A value is any experience that we like; a value may be called a joy. But not every value is an ideal value, and not every joy is true or lasting. On the other hand, an ideal is not, in itself, a value—at least it is not an intrinsic value. An ideal is a concept of what ought to be. The knowledge that we ought to tell the truth is far from being identical with the actual experience of telling the truth, which alone is the value in this field. Ideals are, in a sense, means, or instrumental values, since they are guides for the production and testing of intrinsic values. An ideal is the recipe, not the finished bread, or pie, or cake. It is the architect's plan, not the finished

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

house. It is what Aristotle called the formal cause of anything, plus one trait that Aristotle did not mention, namely, the law laid down by every true ideal: This ideal ought to be made real. The ideals of truth and beauty are not merely plans or concepts of possible experience, but they are also principles which prescribe that truth ought to be known, beauty ought to be created and enjoyed.

Ideals, then, are objective in several senses. They appeal to a universal reason and judge our emotional value-claims by an objective standard. They prescribe that the values indicated by a true ideal ought to exist. They thus imply that there is an objective basis for all true values. If truth did not conform to the ideal of truth and also describe what is objectively real, it could not have genuine truth value. If art did not embody ideal structures and meanings which minds can see to be coherent and harmonious, it would fail as art. And if the experient of natural beauty did not find in the objective world a source of joy-giving harmony, he would certainly not be speaking of the beauty of nature. Hence there is an objective reference both in the beauty of nature and in the beauty of art. The religious experience of the holy is an attitude toward the objective source of value, tested by our highest

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

ideals. Moral goodness alone seems to be more dubious in its objective character. While truth, beauty, and holiness are all ideal objective attitudes toward what lies beyond ourselves, morality is primarily a matter of our own will. Only a will can be morally good. However, the good will, as plainly as the love of truth, beauty, and holiness, must be subjected to ideal norms; it is an attitude toward every possible object of will in other persons and in nature; it is an aspiration to transform the given subjective experience into something more meaningful and better grounded in the objective structure of the world. It is therefore quite incorrect to say that goodness is subjective. Goodness, rather, is exemplified in the will that is fully committed to objective ideals and to values whose laws the will discovers, but does not create.

Values, therefore, are subjective experiences as the subjectivist says; but their true worth does not lie in the mere fact that some experience is enjoying them; it lies rather in the fact that he who enjoys them has tested them by the most objective norms he possesses. As has been hinted, furthermore, the actual experience of values is not to be regarded as a subjective product. By sheer willing no one can produce an experience of value—of true joy and

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

satisfaction—unless he has learned the objective conditions of such value. To experience the value of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado, one must visit the Grand Canyon. To experience the value of playing beautiful music, one must submit to the discipline which alone makes a person a musician. To experience the value of friendship, one must meet the conditions under which alone a true friendship is possible. Value is not an arbitrary whim which can be made and unmade at will; it is not determined by the mores of a group, for any group can err tragically about the conditions of true happiness and joy. Spiritual values are grounded in the nature of existence. If values are desires, they are desires for the highest and best in the real, not for the satisfaction of every impulse and drive in man's biological or impulsive nature. It begins to look as if man's spirit is seeking harmony with a Holy Spirit in the universe beyond man. It looks as if what we call nature were a suitable testing ground for the life of value.

It now appears that we have to say that values are subjective in their existence but objective in their origin and testing. If values are subjective, ideals are objective, and there is some sort of objective value-producing power. Exactly what sort of objectivity is there in ideal spiritual values?

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

It is impossible to say that the objectivity of ideals consists in social agreement. In the first place, there is very little social agreement, throughout history and among all men. In the second place, where social agreement is most intense, as in Nazi Germany, for example, the rational mind is most likely to suspect that genuine objectivity is lacking. In the third place, progress in the knowledge of spiritual values has not come by following group standards, but by criticizing them. The prophets and the philosophers have always held up norms higher than any group has ever exemplified in its actual life. Social agreement must always be tested by its rationality, by its conformity to conditions of reality, and by its relation to the ideal norms of the best minds.

It is also impossible to be satisfied with saying that the objectivity of ideal values consists solely in the fact that ideals are norms. We have agreed that all actual values must be tested by rational ideals. Now we must examine more closely what an ideal is. An ideal or a norm is a goal toward which a person ought to aim, an end acknowledged to be imperative. In so far forth, it is possible that ideals are just as subjective as values, in spite of all we have been saying about their objectivity. After all, purposes and ends are consciously entertained only by persons as plans

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

of their action. If an ideal is objective, and retains anything of its empirical character, it must be objective as a purpose. It has no other function. Since the ideals which we judge to be true ideals are not taken to be the private purposes of any one person or society, they are acknowledged to be superior to all society. Hence they point to a system of purposes in the universe beyond man. That system of purposes is what spiritual thinkers have called the mind of God, the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, there is another reason for viewing ideals as objective in this sense: namely, an ideal can be binding on a rational mind only if it is in some sense and to some degree actually attainable. Ideals define what ought to be in the real world. The ideal aspect of things cannot be set off into a realm of essence, as Santayana would do with it; it cannot be severed from the real world while its devotees live in the famous ivory tower of isolation. The ideal world is a set of purposes regarding the present, concrete real world. Hence every norm implies something about the structure of the real and defines metaphysical features of the real. No ideal ought to be realized unless the real is such that it is reasonable to strive to bring the plan and purpose of that ideal into actual being as real value. A norm that is mere impersonal

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

abstraction with no roots or fruits in reality is no norm that I am justified in accepting; an ideal that is out of all relation to the real and wholly unrealizable is not in any rational sense ideal. It is "up in the air," the very thin air. A rational ideal is one by means of which a person can judge and improve the real. It is a feasible purpose.

If the theory thus roughly sketched corresponds to the real world, the ideals of man's spiritual life, in so far as they are rational and true, are the purposes of the Cosmic Spirit, God, the Holy Spirit. When we discover a new and true ideal, we discover a divine purpose. That statement is no claim that all of God's purposes are known or that any of them are known adequately; it is only the faith that all truly spiritual life is a process of discovering and working experimentally with a Holy Spirit that is but dimly revealed in the highest achievements of man's spirit hitherto. If ideals are purposes, what is objective in God is far more than any human values. No human value actually exists in God. The Holy Spirit is not what man has done in his noblest deeds, but rather is the goal beyond all actual human values toward which those values are reaching and straining. Ideals are the potentialities of the universe for value, not unlike what Whitehead calls the eternal

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

objects. In calling an ideal a potentiality, we mean that it is an unrealized purpose of God for some phase of the universe, but a purpose supported by reality to such an extent that it actually can be approximated. God, of course, experiences his own values; but his ideal is not that we should become God and have his values. It is rather that we should acknowledge his ideals and create values in co-operation with him.

III

What has been said has fallen into somewhat technical philosophical language. This is a result of a desire to be unusually clear and exact. Familiar words seem clear, merely because they are familiar, when their meaning often is foggy. When the noise of the familiar traffic ceases, we are alarmed by the incisive silence. The clearer words of philosophical language seem remote from our noisy reality in the ears of those to whom the language of metaphysics is not a daily idiom. To those untrained in philosophy it will hardly seem possible that our discussion has been about the Divine Spirit of the universe; they may think that we have been playing with words. Perhaps this is because the words refer to a greater reality than they can easily grasp.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

All that has been said in this chapter is simply an interpretation of Tennyson's famous lines:

Speak to Him thou, for He hears, and Spirit with Spirit
can meet—

Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands
and feet.

What our argument has said is that all of man's spiritual aspiration is the speech of man's spirit with a Divine Spirit; that spiritual life cannot be rationally understood, any more than it can be poetically expressed, short of the insight that our highest ideals are plans of God's mind and workings of God's purpose, or are at least our attempts to grasp the divine plan and purpose.

This view is confirmed by the experience of worship, which is very nearly universal in the human race, regardless of man's attitude toward ecclesiastical forms and rituals. Worship is the openness of man's soul to the elevating influences in the universe. The intent of all worship is personal, whatever words or forms may or may not be used. The underlying aim of all worship is that the person or persons who worship may be fully in harmony with the Divine Spirit of the universe. That Spirit is confronted and addressed as if it were a person. Even impersonal philosophers become personalists in their acts of wor-

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

ship. One of the most deeply moving and spiritual theistic prayers I have ever heard came from the lips of a professed humanist. Was he inconsistent? No, I think he was simply being genuine. He was expressing what worship truly meant to him, and forgetting that his theory was inadequate to the experience. In all true worship the holy spirit in man meets the Holy Spirit of God; person touches person, and new life ensues. "Spirit with Spirit can meet."

It will be worth our while to look at the experience of worship, testing it from the standpoint of the insight which we have gained.

When man worships, he always regards the object of worship as a source of value—the supreme source of value. As Eucken often pointed out, the spiritual life is above the level of man's ordinary existence. The spiritual life (*das Geistesleben*) is to be distinguished from our pettily human experience (*das Kleinmenschliche*). This is especially illustrated in worship. In confronting his God, man is conscious of the elevation of his life into the realm of the ideal. In the light of divine purpose man sees what he might have been, and stands condemned; he also sees what he may become, and is inspired. "Man the sinner" becomes man the child of God. His ap-

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

proach to the divine source of value enables man to see the petty as petty, the great as great. It is not too much to say that the experience of worship enables man to see himself in some dim way from God's point of view. In that perspective man sees at one and the same time his insufficiencies and his possibilities. He who forgets either his weakness or his sources of power loses his spiritual balance.

Therefore worship gives new light on the baffling question of the purpose of life. Man's everyday purposes are conflicting and obscure; when most clear, often they are most wrong. They stand in glaring need of criticism and enlightenment. Yet criticism alone is not a source of positive insight and power. All human criticism, furthermore, must itself be criticized by reality. Therefore the spiritual man cannot be satisfied until he has subjected his results to the test of worship. He asks himself: Can the outcome of my thinking be brought directly into relation with the purpose of the Divine Spirit in the experience of worship? If it can, then my thinking was probably moving along the line of the divine purpose. If, on the other hand, in the experience of worship the results of my thinking seem petty and incomplete, it is probable that the Spirit of God is discovering in my spirit some hidden selfishness or

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

low aims. A purpose that has been thus tested in worshipful prayer is likely to be closer to the ideal purpose of the divine than one that has not been so tested.

The worshiper finds that the Divine Spirit is responsive. To some these words will seem hollow. God, they will say, does not answer; he is an awful silence; he speaks no word to the one who prays. Many honest souls have confessed to feeling that their worship was directed to a blank wall. Yet this feeling of the unresponsiveness of God is quite possibly due to demanding that God shall speak our language rather than his. Our language is English or Spanish or German or French; our forefathers thought that Hebrew was the language of heaven, used by God and his angels as well as by Moses. But we do not find that God answers either in Hebrew or in English. The response of the Divine Spirit is not in words, but in power. If the worshiper is not a stronger and better man after his worship than he was before, then his worship was not real worship. It did not reach God. Real worship brings real strength. New aspiration, new courage, and new power result when man's spirit truly confronts the Divine Spirit. Needless to say, the response of the Divine Spirit is not the fulfillment of every human

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

desire. If it were, religion would be God's worship of man rather than man's worship of God. Worship is worth-ship. Worship comes as near to God as the worth of the worshiper's ideals will permit. If God's chief function is to give man what he wants, then man's will is the ideal purpose of the universe. Experience shows that the kind of world that results from such exaltation of man is not worthy of our devotion. Man needs worship, not because he needs to get what he wants, but because he needs to want better things. He needs to discover worthy objects of choice. The divine response to worship is and ought to be, in part at least, a divine judgment on the worshiper, as well as a disclosure of new and higher ideals.

One result of worship, we have seen, is power. In the light of what has been said it is clear that the power we receive in worship is not power to do what we want to do, but power to do what we ought to do. Perhaps one of the reasons that we are dissatisfied with the answers that we get to our prayers is that God's responses are embarrassing to us. He gives us power, but power to do what we ought to do rather than power to do what we want to do. What we ought to do is his will for us, often not our will for ourselves. Possibly God has better ground to

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

complain of man's lack of responsiveness to him than man has to complain of God's lack of responsiveness to man. The power that God gives is adequate to our real needs, although often enough not at all adequate to our wishes and ambitions.

Yet however clarifying and helpful an act of worship may be, it always leaves the worshiper with a sense of mystery. There is no approach to the Eternal Reality that will solve all riddles. Having presented to the Divine Spirit the best we have in thought and will and devotion, we must always confess that we have not explored him fully. Our little minds are too small to receive what he has to give. There is no sense in creating mystery where explanation is possible, and there is no sense in refusing to banish mystery as far as we can.¹ But still less is there sense in pretending that mystery has been overcome when here it is staring us in the face. A reverent sense of mystery is an essential part of all true worship. The worshiper who is not humble cannot worship truly. The know-it-all is simply the learn-no-more, and such a person cannot worship a God beyond him.

As we think over these traits of worship, we can see that they are all personal. If God, the object of our worship, is a source of value, giving us perspec-

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

tive, that is a sign that God is a purposer, and so a person. If worship elicits a spiritual response from God, then God is a personal Spirit, able to respond. If God gives personal power, then God is personal power. He cannot give what he does not have. The fact that God is mystery, of course, does not in itself constitute evidence about what he is. Yet his mystery suggests the mystery of personality. On the one hand, personality is the most certain and indeed the only given reality there is. On the other, it is also the most mysterious. Man's mind seems to be more at home in the impersonal than in the personal. The clearest and most manageable objects we know of are numbers; and numbers are impersonal entities, or at least we abstract entirely from the fact that they are thoughts of persons when we deal with mathematics. The most assured and best developed objective science is physics, which is at the same time the most impersonal. When we get into chemistry, inorganic chemistry is fairly plain sailing; but when we enter the realm of organic chemistry, we are taken aback by what seems wonderful and almost miraculous; we are approaching life and personality, and the mysterious is dawning on us. It would appear that the less we face the actual facts of personal experience, the better off we are for scientific explana-

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

tions. But when we get into the realm of psychology, sociology, and religion, we are baffled by the complexity of the forces at work. In fact, we are so baffled that some of us try to treat personality impersonally so as to escape the difficulties of the mystery of personality; we fly away from the facts of spirit to behaviorism or physiological psychology in order to have something simpler and less mysterious. Personality is not a fixed object with definite limits. It is an ever-flowing stream. Its powers and possibilities are inexhaustible.

This haunting presence of mystery is distressing to many minds. It seems to them to mean that the closer we come to personality, the more absurd and unreasonable everything is. But the facts are capable of quite another construction. It may be that the closer we come to personality the nearer we are to the very heart of concrete reality, and the better we understand what is concretely reasonable. The fact that man can master mathematics easily but master spirit with difficulty may also be a sign of the truth that more of the eternal reality and energy of the Divine is operative at the level of personality than at the level of the mathematical or the physical or the biological. If the evidence of worship points toward an eternal personal Spirit as the object of worship,

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

then we have in human personality a revelation (or at least an adumbration) of the rationality and beauty and goodness of God, as well as of his ineffable transcendence of man's grasp. Indeed, in every personality a greater depth of divine mystery is explored than in any precise abstraction or in any physical process. No one can ever fully understand himself; he sometimes feels that he can understand another, whom he loves, better than he can understand his own whims and queernesses. But every person is ultimately unfathomable to himself and to others—a fact which Heraclitus may have had in mind when he said that no one can reach the boundaries of the soul, no matter how far he goes down. Whatever we say about a soul, there is always more to say. The potentiality of infinite investigation and growth that is suggested by the mystery of personality points in the direction of eternal life and Eternal Spirit.

Worship, then, is a commitment of the human person to the Eternal Person. Worship may occur when the worshiper does not believe that God is a person; but, if we are right, every worshiper is in fact committing himself to an actually personal Spirit, whether he understands the implications of his worship or not. One of the major tasks of philosophy is to help the doubter, the unbeliever, and the

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

seeker to discover what they really mean by their devotion to ideal values. Regardless of theory, there is in all worship an illustration of what St. Paul called "the witness of the Spirit." "The Spirit itself," says Paul, "beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Religion is an experience of the otherness of Divine Spirit, an experience which, at its higher levels, is as convincing and satisfying in its objectivity as is the experience in human conversation that we are really talking to another mind. Yet, as those who have argued with solipsists know, it is all but impossible to give a perfectly conclusive proof of the objective existence of the human being with whom we happen to be conversing. The witness of the Spirit is not to be taken as a substitute for rational thought. It is, however, a fact which rational thought has to reckon with; it is a clue, a hint, an invitation.

IV

Hints have already been dropped about the all too frequent discrepancy between the realities of the spiritual life and man's ability to give an adequate rational account of those realities. We stammer when we tell the story of the inner life. Although the spiritual life points to a Divine Spirit, an Eternal

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

Person in whom or by whom we and all things live and move and have their being, it is still true that man finds the impersonal more easily intelligible than the personal. Every experienced person knows of individuals who are devoted to the spiritual life without sharing the faith in a Divine Spirit. They may even have abandoned hope of any explanation or any faith that will account for their most precious experiences.

Does this mean that we may as well dispense with God and take the fruits of the Spirit without its roots? Some have drawn this inference. However, no kind of spiritual life can flourish long in a mind that is censored; a veto on thinking ("a moratorium on cosmology") may result in an intense concentration on practical problems for a while, but in the long run will leave the spirit arid. Action without goal or reason is no life for a man. No agreement to evade the problems and mysteries of life can be or will ever be kept. A peace based on such a pact is as unjust to the mind as Versailles was to humanity. Instead of leading us to abandon the tasks of thought in the interest of superficial action, the differences of opinion among those who are devoted to spiritual values should lead to quite different conclusions. They should lead us to see that the power of spirit.

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

is greater than man's power to understand it. The differences, instead of leading us to conclude that only man is involved, and that we had better give up search for God, should lead rather to a power so much greater than we, so much broader in its scope than man can grasp, that we must see it incompletely and from different points of view. Our very differences, therefore, are testimony to the Divine Spirit.

Spiritual life may, indeed, be realized in many of its aspects in persons who repudiate any thought of the Divine Spirit as being a personal consciousness, and even deny that there is an impersonal power in the universe friendly to value. Julian Huxley, in his faith that "man stands alone," is not unspiritual. Yet the faith in values or ideals that a man may have under these conditions is a faith that limps. Ideals without roots in the reality of things seem rather to be desires that the universe be different from what it is. Ideals which indicate the very direction of the purposive movement of the universe are an entirely different matter. If the stronger faith is also more rational and truer to the facts of spiritual life, why take refuge in the faith that limps? Does not man need all the faith he can get, and the most effective kind of faith, if he is to find his way out of the jungle of today?

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

Those who weaken faith needlessly are undermining the foundations of human life. The damage they do is not to be slurred over. Yet in all frankness it must be granted that the real Fifth Column in the Holy War is not the humanist group that we have been criticizing; it is to be found rather among those who acknowledge the Divine Spirit, but lack the essentials of human spirit. No profession of faith in metaphysical reality is of any spiritual or intellectual value if it is not rooted and grounded in a genuine experience of human values. It is better to have human pity and mercy and loyalty and to deny God than to affirm God and then to deny pity and mercy and human loyalty. It is, however, most irrational to take the existence of such abstract and unethical believers as in any sense a refutation of the reality of the Holy Spirit. It is no more reasonable to use the wild talk of religious dogmatists as a ground for disbelief in God than it would be to take the ignorant mouthings of some uneducated person about relativity as a disproof of science. No, unspiritual believers in the Divine Spirit are not an argument against God; they are simply an argument against themselves. They refute themselves by their inner incoherence; they leave the reasonableness of the Divine Spirit untouched.

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

We have spoken of the limping spirituality of those who do not believe in God. Let us go further, and be more frank. We need to confess that all human spirituality limps sadly. At all levels, the spiritual life is incomplete, partly incoherent, maimed. There is always sin in the New Testament sense; the mark of life is always more or less missed. Yet the main point is this, that with all our failure and limping we can see that there is a mark. We could not become discouraged or pessimistic and cynical did we not see the goal which we are missing. That goal, which is the despair of the hopeless, is a perpetual evidence of the work of the Divine Spirit in man's life.

V

In a few words, now, let us sum up what we have seen about the meaning of the Divine Spirit. To interpret the human spirit as being the sign of the presence of a Divine and Superhuman Spirit in the cosmos is to be committed to the faith that there is a common purpose for all spirits, a common problem with a possible co-operative solution. The struggle of spirit against the unspiritual is dire and wearisome, but the gleaming goal draws us on. Wherever there is loyalty to spiritual values and to the co-operative

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

endeavor to overcome the obstacles to their achievement, there man instinctively acknowledges that something divine is at work, and something worthy of worship. To acknowledge Divine Spirit in the universe is not to be a bland optimist. Religion is ruggedly realistic. It faces the facts of sin and suffering without blinking them. There are tensions and struggles and obstacles and sins in the world; a believer in the Divine Spirit will in no way deny the reality of these dark facts. But he will see that they are not all there is; in the dark he will foresee the dawn. The Divine Spirit means that this is forever a universe of well-grounded hope. The possibilities of goodness are inexhaustible. Although there always are obstacles, there always are means of coping with them. Through them or in spite of them the Divine Spirit perseveres. Faith in Divine Spirit is faith that no event of any kind, physical or personal, will ever destroy Divine Spirit or its purpose of loyalty to the ideal ends and aims of existence. If ever this faith and its courage was needed, it is today. Today, indeed, we have ample proof of the power of evil spirit. Since 1923 spirit, the spirit of one man who was then in a prison, has transformed modern history into a veritable hell. Are we so blind as to believe that evil spirit has this miraculous power

SPIRIT AS DIVINE

while good spirit is powerless? A larger view will show us that the evil spirit triumphs for a time only, and triumphs only because the good spirit has become weakened by compromise with evil. The meaning of our thought in this chapter is that there is one good spirit, the Divine Spirit, that never will compromise with evil—never has done so and never can do so. If that be true, the ancient problem of the meaning of life finds a solution in the unfaltering purpose of the eternal Good Spirit.

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

Thus far we have considered the meaning of spirit, its personal character, its social nature, and its divine source, in successive chapters. We now turn to the thought of spirit as developing, including under spirit both its human and its divine manifestations.

Many minds feel the thought of spirit as developing to be abhorrent. Divine Spirit they associate with the eternal and the unchanging, "with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." It follows that in so far as a human spirit partakes of the divine it needs but to remain good; no development is possible. Only the evil in man requires his spirit to develop. The evil man needs to grow away from his weaknesses, taints, sins, and errors. But when once the stage of spirit is reached, perfection is achieved, and further development is not needed. The goal and essence of spiritual striving is to know God and to enjoy him forever, to contemplate the eternal. Ever since Pythagoras, Parmenides, and

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

Plato, the predominant emphasis in spiritual culture has been on the changeless and eternal. Although orthodox Christians have thought of God as imparting a progressive revelation, of the incarnation as an event of cosmic moment, of advance from bodies terrestrial to bodies celestial, of man's need of spiritual change and growth, of the kingdom of heaven as growing like a grain of mustard seed, yet all of these teachings put together did not overcome the emphasis of theologians on the essential unchangeability of God, an emphasis inherited from Plato's Ideas and Aristotle's Pure Form. Kierkegaard's doctrine of the absolute qualitative difference between time and eternity, and hence of the intrinsic superiority of the eternal over anything temporal and developing, embodies the classic theology in striking form. Throughout most of the Christian history the emphasis of those who cultivated the spiritual life has been laid less on the actual development and unfolding of the powers of spirit than on forgetting or minimizing the struggles of this life in a Pilgrim's Progress to another and a better country—a Celestial City where the soul stands in the continual presence of the Eternal and Changeless God. Such growth as the spirit of man experienced in this life was supposed to consist chiefly of humble submission to the

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

acts of supernatural grace, acts which involved no real change or development in the supernatural, but were merely a revelation of its unchanging nature.

Christian philosophy of history did, it is true, mark an advance over the pagan conception of the ever-repeated cycles of a cosmic treadmill, forever going through the same series of motions with no real advance. In opposition to the pagan view, the Judaeo-Christian conception rested on the faith that history was moving to a great consummation, a *telos*, an end or goal, at which Messiah would appear, or Christ would come again, and the rule of God would prevail. This Christian ideal of a goal for history, however, fell far short of a clear conception of eternal spiritual development. Once the goal was achieved, the saved were to enjoy their salvation, and the lost to endure their suffering forever, with no hope of any essential change or growth. Development in this life was to lead up to a state in which there is no further development possible.

With some more or less minor deviation, this remained for many centuries the picture of the spiritual life for Occidental culture—and the Orient was even more devoted to the changeless than the Occident. Not until the nineteenth century was there a new stage of spiritual insight, one that led to a deeper

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

comprehension of Jesus' parables of growth and of the potentialities of spirit. The nineteenth century was the century of evolution. Not only was it the century of Darwin and biological evolution, and of Marx and economic evolution; it was the century of Hegel and spiritual evolution, as well as of Nietzsche and his dream of the evolution of man's personality into a Superman. The pitch of the music of the spirit in modern times was set by Hegel more than by any other one man. One must divest oneself of all ideas of a block universe and a changeless Absolute in arriving at a view of the true Hegel, the evolutionist of spiritual life. He saw that spirit, at its very heart, is movement, growth, development, creativity. He discerned in spirit an unquenchable yearning for more truth, more reality, more companionship, more beauty, and more completeness. He rejected the view of spirit as a static spectator of fixed and changeless Platonic Ideas. He saw it as life and upward surge. His vast perspectives gave new vitality to the study of the Bible, of history, of religions, of politics, of sociology, and of the relations of science to culture. While he erred in many details, he opened unsuspected vistas which were destined to cause the human spirit to break many of its

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

chains while becoming richer by a new use of the treasures of humanity's past.

This principle of spiritual evolution had been implicit in religion, had been seen dimly by ancient philosophers—especially by Heraclitus, Hegel's favorite from the Greek past—but had been neglected to such an extent that progress hitherto had consisted largely, not in a clear grasp of the principle of spiritual life and growth, but rather in the transition from one conception of the changeless (as seen in Rome) to a different conception of the same changeless (as seen in Wittenberg or in Geneva). Now at length the light began to dawn; perhaps the giver of life is himself life; perhaps the universal spirit is a spirit of growth and development. This thrilling yet baffling possibility now began to engage man's spirit.

At once let us warn against a misunderstanding. To turn away from the old idea of a changeless Eternal One to a Spirit of growth and development does not mean that all landmarks are thrown away and that nothing abides. Sophistic relativity is not the alternative to Parmenides and the changeless One. Let us examine the nature of spirit with the serious effort to discover just what is meant by living spirit in the universe, as contrasted with changeless and self-identical unity. Is Divine Spirit eternally a seed

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

that is forever identical with itself, or is its eternal nature an eternal process of seeds growing into new life? Is spiritual experience one great moment of crisis, or is it eternal life? In either case there are eternal truths and laws of spirit. In the former case they are changeless laws of the changeless; in the latter they are changeless laws of life and growth and new creation. Which is nearer to the truth about spirit?

I

No one should suppose that the belief in developing spirit means a denial of everything permanent and eternal. When minds as different as Aristotle, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and John Locke all agree in asserting eternal reality, it is not probable that they are talking nonsense. John Locke, in his usual sober language, argues that "if we know that there is some real being, and that nonentity cannot produce any real being, it is an evident demonstration, that from eternity there has been something; since what was not from eternity had a beginning; and what had a beginning must be produced by something else." He quaintly summarizes, "Therefore something eternal." As the ancients put it, *ex nihilo, nihil fit*—"from nothing, nothing is made."

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

Therefore there must eternally have been something. The concept of unbegun duration is one which our imagination cannot even faintly grasp, but which our thought must acknowledge; hence Kant rightly calls eternity sublime.

By like reasoning men of the spirit have argued that if there is now any real spirit, then from eternity there has always been spirit, since nothing but spirit could produce spirit. Religious faith is faith in the eternity of spirit, specifically in the eternity of Divine Spirit. The French translation of the Bible is peculiarly satisfying when for "the Lord," or the awkward form "Jehovah," it substitutes "*l'Éternel*," the Eternal One. The Hebrew and Christian Scriptures are pervaded with the thought of the eternity of spirit. "In the beginning . . . the Spirit of God moved." These words from Genesis suggest at once the eternity and the developing nature of spirit. So too do the words from St. Paul in his letter to Galatian Christians. He writes: "He that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." Here we see the eternal united with the developing processes of sowing and reaping. In declaring that the things that are seen are temporal and that the things that are not seen are eternal, the Apostle does not mean to teach that life is transient and only the static

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

and unliving is eternal. He means, rather, to have us infer that the spirit is the only life of really fruitful development. Even Aristotle says in Book Lambda of his *Metaphysics*, Chapter 7, that "life belongs to God." But, he goes on to add, the divine substance is "eternal and unmovable and separate from sensible things," and is "impassive and unalterable." If this be life, it is surely no growing life, for it is one in which all potentialities have been actualized in "pure form."

The Spirit is eternal; but as friends and interpreters of the Spirit we must choose between a view of Eternal Spirit as immovable and unalterable and a view of Eternal Spirit as developing life. Aristotle, the philosopher of development, sought a God free from the process of development, serving only as its perfect consummation and crown. Christianity, in its essential meaning, seeks an incarnate God, who is forever immanent in all development; or, as we may say almost equally well, a God in whom all development is immanent.

II

If we take the eternity of spirit as fundamental, let us see whether we can reconcile the thought of eternity with the thought of development. If they can-

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

not be reconciled, then we are in a hopeless quandary; for if anything eternal cannot act in time, cannot initiate and effect changes, cannot cope with temporal situations as they arise from whatever cause, then the Eternal Spirit is a helpless spectator, even if he is Aristotle's Unmoved Mover. If Spirit is both an unmoved and an unmoving mover, then it is no more than a target at which the real forces in the universe may shoot; it may be loved, but it cannot love in return; it may seem attractive, but it cannot attract. The real explanation of all real action, then, must lie, not in the target, or (according to the other figure) in the passive beloved, but only in those forces that move toward the target, or that organize life in accordance with love. Such a view makes Spirit more remote from the world than is a St. Simeon Stylites from the ordinary concerns of life. Spirit is not up on a pillar. The very nature and function of spirit is, not to contemplate life impotently from afar, but rather to share in it, to remold it, to animate it with new purpose, new form, new meaning.

On the other hand, if spirit is no passive spectator of things, but is, as we say, the very meaning of life, then spirit must constantly produce and participate in development. No one viewing this world as it is

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

now can for one moment suppose that the work of spirit is completed. The human spirit has infinite tasks (Kant's "*unendliche Aufgaben*") ahead of it in every field—the intellectual, the social, the moral, the political, the economic, the aesthetic, the religious. If we ascribe to the Divine Spirit the purpose of soul making in this world, then it appears that the Eternal Spirit has eternally new tasks—tasks set not merely by the perpetual creation of new souls and by the problems following from the freedom of each soul, but also by complicated interrelations of souls, and their tensions and sufferings and struggles with the brute facts of real existence.

True as it is that the thought of the Eternal suggests the thought of changelessness, and certain as it is that there are changeless truths—principles which are true at all times, forever—it is equally true that this fact cannot possibly exhaust our conception of spirit. The bare existence to all eternity of Plato's Ideas—Justice, and the Good, and all the rest of them—would not constitute a spiritual fact unless those Ideas were made guiding principles of actual experience by actually developing spirits. It is just as unspiritual to have ideals which are merely abstract and self-identical, inactive and dead, as it is to have power without ideals and guiding principles. Dead

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

ideals kill idealism. Live materialism is preferable to dead idealism, if we must choose. But the choice is not necessary. We can and must have a living idealism. Plato's God was not the realm of Ideas, but rather the active, spiritual Artisan, the Demiurge, who made the world with a tender love for the perfection of everything in it, as far as perfection could be achieved in any possible world. Plato may have thought of time as the movable image of eternity, but his God was not bare eternity; his God acted in time for the realization of purposes that took time. And this seems to be the essential nature of spirit—to move toward the fulfillment of purposes which express eternally unchanging goodness and love in eternally changing and creative forms on many levels of inexhaustible variety. The perfection of spirit is no single experience, no eternally static condition of being; perfection means rather the eternal perfectibility of spirit, and consequently a spiritual universe means one of eternal development which requires unbegun and unending duration for its expression. If one asks: Will the goal, then, never be attained? the answer is that the goal of spirit is by its very nature inexhaustible. It is this fact, and this alone, which is the germ of truth in Kierkegaard's and Barth's exaggerated doctrine about the infinite quali-

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

tative difference between time and eternity. It is not that the human and the divine are totally different (the eternal is not *totaliter aliter*, not *das ganz Andere*) but rather the divine is the inexhaustible and creative source and fulfillment of the highest values of any moment of time.

The Eternal Spirit, then, is eternally creative. If God acted when the world was first made (supposing that there was a first making), he still acts perpetually in the sustaining of the world order and in the creation of new forms and new persons. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." A carpenter acts and leaves what he has made. A Creator acts continually. When Hegel brought the Philosophy of Mind to a close at the end of his *Encyclopaedia*, he quoted the passage from Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, Book Lambda, to which we have already made allusion; and he selected as the climactic paragraph the one that speaks of God as life and "energy." And the Hegel who has been accused of holding to a Block Universe wrote as the final words of his own text his account of the Absolute: "The eternal self-fulfilling Idea occupies, produces and enjoys itself eternally as Absolute Spirit."¹ If even Hegel calls the Eternal an onward movement and development

¹ Sec. 577.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

(as he does elsewhere in this section), one must far out-Hegel Hegel to make God utterly changeless. Aristotle did not realize fully what he was saying when he declared that "Life belongs to God." His followers and most orthodox Christians have found it easier to rest in the thought of God as an eternally completed realization of all possibilities than to grasp the idea of God as one who eternally acts and creates; yet an active God is as much a need of the religious as of the intellectual nature of man. A real God is a living God; Spirit is life.

In so far as we think solely in terms of bare abstract concepts like those of mathematics, we think of the eternal as something like the Platonic Ideas, unchanging, inactive, depersonalized entities. In so far as we think of the eternal as the ground or cause or explanation or purpose of our actual experiences in this world, we have to think of it as active. In the early stages of spiritual development man was so utterly abashed by the contemplation of his weakness in the presence of the enduring forces about him that his reason faltered. He dimly felt that the divine was to be found in magic or in madness. Even Saul joined in the raving of the prophets. This identification of the Divine Spirit with the source of human mania—among the Hebrews, as in Plato's

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

theory of poetry—serves to symbolize man's inadequacy in the presence of the mysterious and divine. But it is indeed madness to say that God is mad. The Eternal Spirit of the universe is no madness nor raving. Spiritual life, as it is revealed in man's highest moments, is a spirit of goodness, of temperance, of reason and sanity.

When we draw inferences and construct faith on the basis of the noblest that has been disclosed to us in the greatest characters who have ever lived, we take the spiritual life to be the life of development of man's ideal purposes. It is growth, as Professor H. N. Wieman has so often said; "growth in holiness" as James Mudge used to put it. Not madness, but the cure of madness; not Tertullian's "absurd," but the understanding and conquest of all seeming absurdity; not "speaking with tongues," but "prophesying" reveals to us the purpose of the Eternal Spirit. Every spiritual value is, so to speak, a formula for eternity. Truth, goodness, beauty, worship, and love are the great spiritual values. In a living, creative universe of personal growth and social relations, is it conceivable that any one of these values should ever be exhausted? Truth could never be completely known until all possible deeds had been committed, all creations finished, and the "Owl of Mi-

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

nerva" had taken wings for good and all, at the falling of the final cosmic night! Goodness could never be completely realized until there were no more persons left in the universe, human or divine; as long as there is a person, so long he needs to continue the exercise of his goodness. Beauty is essentially, in one of its central aspects, creative and imaginative. Is it conceivable that, in a social and interacting universe, all forms of beauty could be completely and finally exhausted? Let the Idea of Beauty be as unchangeable as the *Symposium* declares it to be, still that Idea is but a law or rule prescribing the invention and creation of inexhaustibly many forms and applications. Real beauty is forever growing. Each form of beauty reveals the eternal purpose, but reveals it on different levels. Beauty is not dead; and each form of beauty, however perfect it be, is a living symbol of creation and a spur to new creation. If the Taj Mahal were the consummation of all beauty, and the very finis of creation's book, then either its beauty would begin to perish as soon as it was made, or else all the forces of the cosmos would have to work together to maintain that lovely tomb in being, and all souls everywhere would have to be trained in the appreciation of that ultimate beauty. Even

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

final beauty could not be real or be enjoyed without activity and development in the personal universe. While describing the spiritual life in the *Laws* 906A, Plato says of it that "such a battle . . . is undying, and needs a wondrous watchfulness." Spiritual life is active; when action ends, it collapses; but in a world of free persons action need never end.

As it is with truth and goodness and beauty, so is it with worship and love. True worship never palls on the reverent soul; he who is weary of worship is not worshiping, just as he who tires of love is not loving. Real worship is never vain repetition. The forms of worship without the reality may indeed be deadly. They are weariness to the flesh and sacrilege to the spirit. But real worship, with its mystic elevation, is a source of life and growth to the soul. Its potential energies can never be measured in any finite time. Of all the values, love is most plainly inexhaustible. It requires the relating of the soul to God and to man; love excels knowledge in value only because it uses all knowledge for its intended purpose. Love brings together all truth, all goodness, all beauty, and all worship, and fuses them into a new creation. The task of transforming this present world of human persons into a community of love

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

is one that is of itself inexhaustible enough for practical purposes. But if the eye of spiritual imagination could discern a time in the distant infinities, beyond all Pearl Harbors, when all souls everywhere had gladly accepted the rule of love in their lives, one would still have to say that "the end is not yet." Even when every will is good, or rather, precisely because every will is good, the task of the creation of new and higher types of experience must go on. Love is not the end of labor; rather it is the beginning of new joy and new possibilities in labor.

Pilgrim's Progress, in the light of this discussion, has the picture reversed, for Christian is more spiritual in the growing experience on the way to the Celestial City than he is on arriving at his destination. St. John the Revelator tries to guard against a static view of the Holy City by pointing out that "the tree of life bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month." If this figure of speech means anything, it must mean that the eternal life of spirit is productive on a scale and a level far beyond what the present stage of development on this earth makes possible. Spirit is development. What we call physical energies, at their most powerful, are low levels of Spirit and feeble intimations of its energies on higher levels of development.

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

III

As has just been pointed out, development means a change of level, a heightening of spiritual powers and the emergence of new characters. Just as biological evolution can go on only by virtue of the creative process which brings into being variations which are fit to survive, so spiritual evolution goes on by means of the same creative process—the Eternal Spirit which eternally brings forth new forms of spiritual life in personal experience.

Apart from any metaphysical interpretation, it is plain matter of fact that whenever a certain spiritual level has been reached by a human being, this means that an ideal has been to some extent realized in actual experience. The ideal is no longer a plan, a possibility, a dream; it has entered into the actual stuff of life. What was a castle in Spain or a heavenly vision is now a real dwelling place of the soul. In other words, the level of life has been raised. The ideal was somewhere in the upper air; it was ethereal and imaginative. Real life was going on below. When the ideal is realized we might say that it has been brought down to earth. As a matter of fact, something far more remarkable has happened; earth has been raised to heaven. The ideal is not lowered

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

by being made real, but real life is elevated. The soul of the man who has become spiritual to any degree has been raised to a higher level. Habits of attention are different; interests are transformed; different goals are chosen; different achievements are valued. This is what is meant by a change of level. A new interest and enthusiasm has come into life.

Spirit, therefore, is the upward movement of the universe. The principle of spirit is in opposition to whatever is merely static, or stagnant, or mechanical, or dull. The prayer wheel is not made spiritual by turning out prayers; rather it mechanizes spirit. Saying one's prayers, as we put it, is mechanical and dead, whereas praying is alive and spiritual. All words for spirit are words of life. The active and creative life of spirit dominates the Scriptures from the sublime account in Genesis of how "the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters" to the closing scene in Revelation, where "the Spirit and the bride say, Come." Action and invitation to action—this is the essence of Spirit, giving life from the very start of creation an impulse to higher levels.

It is perhaps worth while to remark parenthetically that the Revelator, fearful of the heights his vision had scaled, sought to petrify spirituality at the level which he had reached by adding the famous curses:

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.

Here we have an interesting study in human struggles with spirituality. It is as though the Revelator had written: "The Spirit says come and take the water of life freely; rise forever to higher levels. But I, the Revelator, grow dizzy and insist that no one ever try to rise higher than I have gone. You mustn't take the Spirit too seriously!" Perhaps the Revelator had an inkling of the weakness of his position when he inserted the words, "I testify." He was, perhaps, doubtful whether the Divine Spirit would testify as he was doing.

The spirit cannot be stopped by threats or maledictions from within Scripture or from without it. Neither churches, nor governments, nor traditions can quench the fire of the spirit. Wherever men have recognized the presence of a spirit, there they have seen a force that changes life from its ordinary levels. Evil spirits debase man's level. Good spirits elevate his level. No spirit ever leaves him just as

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

he was in the first place. The gospel writer says that Jesus cast out devils by the Spirit of God. Evil spirits are powers which are expelled only by a higher power. Spiritual life in the best sense is a raising of man's purposes nearer to the level of divine purposes. St. Paul doubtless had something of the sort in mind when he wrote that "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." To raise the level of a life is to change its leading principles, and the only change that is an elevation is a change in the direction of the divine purpose.

While it must be remembered that true spiritual development is upward-looking—a movement toward God—it is equally important to remember that spiritual development is also forward-looking. The eternity of the Divine Spirit, we have seen, is not a timeless "standing now," but is the unbegun and unending experience of creative loyalty to good, in an ever-enduring process of spiritual achievement. This means that the goal of spirituality cannot be adequately attained either by any present knowledge of God or even by any present communion with him. The upward look is only part of the goal; the forward look is also essential. Spirituality, therefore, means the remaking of life in accordance with spiritual ideals. It means action, the individual's co-

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

operation with man and with God. It means, as St. Paul says, a new creation; that is, new tasks, new standards, new motives. Professor Bernhard Duhm, the Swiss theologian, once wrote a striking little book on *The Coming Kingdom of God*. His point was that the prophets were always looking for the coming of the kingdom; usually they expected it very soon, "before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good," "before the child shall have knowledge to cry, My father, and my mother," the victory will come. At the very least "this generation shall not pass, till all these things be done," and the kingdom is here. The kingdom is always coming soon; it is at the very gates; it is among you; and yet it never really comes. At least it never comes in a finished form, not in the predicted form. Forever we must repeat: The end is not yet. The picture of the forever-coming kingdom of God is an apt parable of the eternal forward look of the spirit. The humble everyday saying, so full of truth, that woman's work is never done, may be connected in thought with Goethe's famous line in *Faust*: "The eternal-feminine draws us on." Woman's work is never done. Man's work is never done. God's work is never done. Spiritual life lies in the doing, not the completing of the work.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

In order to avoid any possible misunderstanding, let us repeat what was clearly implied in Chapter II, namely, that all the changes in level of the spiritual life are changes within personality. As far as we can know or think or imagine, there is nothing higher than personality. One hears much talk of the superpersonal. What really is meant by most such language is either the superphysical or the superhuman. Both of those ideas are quite legitimate. In spite of its close ties with the physical, spirit is not physical. In fact, no part of personality is physical, not even our most sensuous consciousness; for personality is consciousness, not body. Body is the continuing and supporting environment of personality in the earthly order of being; body is the mirror and expression of personality; but body is not person, and person is not body. Personality, even now, is superphysical, and in a future stage of existence will probably be entirely free from any dependence on what we call the physical order. Personality we experience as human, but it may also be regarded as superhuman. The Eternal Divine Spirit must have properties which no human being ever experienced, and must be devoid of many of the limitations which human persons experience. Thus the concept of superhuman personality is needed. But although a personality divine or

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

“angelic” may be both superphysical and superhuman, it is still a personality as long as it is a conscious being with memory, purpose, and ideal norms. A wholly superpersonal being would have to be one that lacked consciousness, memory, purpose, and ideals, and still was superior to any being which possessed these traits. To talk about the superpersonal in any such sense is very close to self-contradiction; it is talking about a being that is good, yet lacks all the known conditions of goodness. There is no higher level of spirit than the level of personality, as far as our rational thought or faith can grasp. All that the spirit can strive for and should strive for is ever higher forms of personal development. To abandon personality is to abandon both values and existence.

In another sense, too, spiritual life is personal. The development of spirit is wholly within personal consciousness. If there is any unconscious or impersonal being in the world, such a being is of no moment to the spiritual life (or to unspiritual life, for that matter), except in so far as it has effects within personality. The tragedy and the comedy of life consists of a person’s thoughts and feelings and purposes and ideals, as related to experienced obstacles and difficulties. Whatever the origin of these obstacles, they figure in the spiritual life only as

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

pains or tensions or strivings within personality. The spiritual problem is basically the problem of how one can understand oneself and learn to live with oneself. The worst evasion of spiritual dignity befalls those who seek for escapes and evasions; anything to avoid facing myself and my spiritual task, is the motto of lost and wandering souls.

One of the greatest works of genius in the nineteenth century, without which modern culture would have been vastly different, is Hegel's *Phenomenology of Mind*—great because it traced the development of personality from the barest sense experiences up to the richest insight into total meaning of all existence and all ideals. The blindness and evil of much in the present stage of human history lies in the degradation of personality, in its failure to carry through the development which the philosopher described. Personalities are enslaved to other persons, who have themselves abandoned the ideals of spiritual life; or they are enslaved to impersonal ideals such as blood and soil; or, worst of all, they are enslaved to machines which they themselves have made, machines whose sole function is to destroy. Since the personal is the real, and the real will endure, the perversions of the present cannot last. But the present is evidence of the crying need for spirit-

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

ual development within personalities, and for the remaking of the social order so as to set personality free.

IV

The development of spirit, we have said, is a change in level of personal experience. In other words, it is an improving quality of life. In principle almost everyone would grant this. We now add that spiritual development is also an increase in sheer quantity of value. At this, some idealistic souls may be inclined to protest. Mere quantity is not important, they will say. A billion gallons of white paint are not whiter than a single drop; a billion tons of sugar are no sweeter than one grain. But these illustrations are on the impersonal level of thought. When we are talking of persons, one may be good; but, we say, two heads are better than one. This is partly, of course, because of the wisdom that comes from social criticism and shared social wisdom. Yet it is also true that a world with two equally good persons in it is twice as good as a world with either one alone, regardless of their social relations. A person is an intrinsic value, the bearer and realizer of spiritual values. Just as a world with two persons is twice as good as a world with only one person, so

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

also a person with two great ideals is twice as good as a person with only one great ideal, provided the ideals in question are both worthy ones. Cosmic development of spiritual life, then, requires both an increase in the number of persons in the universe and also an increase in the number of values they experience. Value requires both repetition and variety.

This discussion will naturally remind anyone who is familiar with philosophy of religion of Höffding's conception of religion as presupposing the axiom of the conservation of values. What we are saying is that a developing spiritual universe is one in which it would not be enough to conserve existing values; the perpetuation of the *status quo* would be far from ideal, whether on the Revelator's level or any other. While it is true that value must be preserved in a spiritual universe, it is also true that it must be increased. A good life that is standing still isn't even standing still. If the reader will forgive two coined words not in the dictionary, we may speak of "axiosoteria" (value salvation) as meaning the conservation of values, and "axiogenesis" (value development) as meaning increase of values. Then we have the concise formula, no axiosoteria without axiogenesis. W. R. Sorley, reading Höffding, became aware of this truth, and criticized Höffding's axiom as we have

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

done. The odd thing is, however, that Höffding, a few pages later in his book, had anticipated this very criticism and had himself asserted plainly on page 11 of his *Philosophy of Religion* that value can be preserved only by being increased.

A great peril to spiritual growth is the fact that every value achieved seems so precious that it is retained and glorified to such an extent that any thought of going beyond it seems treason. Too much spiritual life points back to an experience long past. It would seem that the writer of the Gospel of John had this peril in mind when he quoted Jesus as saying: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." After the Old Testament came Jesus. Beyond Jesus is the Spirit. Yet every stage is a moment in the manifestation of one and the same Eternal Spirit in time. Every stage is precious and adds something that must never be lost; yet no stage exhausts the possibilities of spiritual growth. As Höffding, in another passage² intimated, existence is never finished. Parodying an ancient writer we may say that of the making of new values there is no end. Possibly St. Paul had this, or something like it, in

² P. 166.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

mind when he uttered the great truth that "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." If those who have based their theology on St. Paul instead of on Jesus, or on actual experience, had laid as much stress on this sublime insight as they did on Paul's echoes of rabbinical traditions or of Jewish apocalyptic, the spiritual life of centuries might have been far more vital and free.

The thought of spirit as increase of value connects with the theory of revelation. In the main, theories of revelation have been either dogmatic or teleological. The dogmatic theories have held that divine revelation consists in imparting final truths or at least in communicating perfectly correct information from God to man. The teleological theories, however, have held that the essence of revelation lay in no absolute content of truth, but rather in events and influences which stirred the spirit of man to move to a higher plane of existence, and thus to develop into a closer harmony with the divine purpose. It is clear that the idea of spiritual life as increase of value is identical in principle with the teleological theory of revelation.

Looking at the matter from another point of view, there emerges the insight that the kinds of value that can increase indefinitely are spiritual; those that can-

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

not are unspiritual. The unspiritual need not necessarily be physically harmful or morally evil, but it is definitely on a lower level of existence than the spiritual. Food is good for us; but enough is enough, and too much food leads easily to satiety. The practice of certain physical vices leads not only to satiety, but also in the end to the utmost boredom and ennui. No one is more weary of life than the typical rake who has exhausted himself in pursuit of the so-called pleasures of the flesh. On the other hand, spiritual values are such that it is impossible to have too much of them. Of wise and true love, of sound faith and well-grounded hope, we cannot weary. There is no such thing as a surfeit of them.

In one of his striking passages, St. Paul tells us, in a prose poem, that:

The fruit of the Spirit is
love, joy, peace,
longsuffering, gentleness, goodness,
faith, meekness, temperance:
against such there is no law.

There can be no just law against the fruits of the Spirit, because the laws of spirit are the laws of the increase of life. It is interesting that Paul uses the word "fruits," a word that embodies the principle of the increase of life. Paul is not very fond of

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

speaking of "works"; and he is somewhat afraid even of the "gifts" of the spirit, or at least he discriminates sharply between them. "Desire spiritual gifts," he remarks, "but rather that ye may prophesy. . . . I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also. . . . I had rather speak five words with my understanding . . . than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." The man who was thus critical of spiritual gifts, when they took an overemotional or ecstatic form, found no reason to criticize the genuine fruits of the spirit. Applying the maxim of the increase of value, we can see why. The gifted man may not be a spiritual man. The increase of the fruits elevates human life to a nobler and more divine level, but the increase of speaking with unknown tongues can only contribute to confusion and disorder. What cannot increase without harm is plainly on no very high level of spirituality.

St. Paul had far more penetration than did the too-cautious John Calvin. In the *Institutes* Calvin wrote: "It is also our duty to remain in ignorance of what it is not for our advantage to know."³ This puts Calvin in a peculiar spiritual position; unless he, as legislator, knows the very items which he says it is our duty not to know, how can he know in which

³ I, 14, iii.

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

direction to prohibit the growth of knowledge in his subjects? How can he know what is and what is not advantageous? Calvin was not on a high spiritual plane when he issued this veto against the growth of spirit. If we apply the law of increase, we may safely know what Calvin forbids; and if we see that some areas show no promise of increase of value, we should indeed abstain from spiritual commitments in those areas that we judge to be unpromising; but when Calvin restricted knowledge, he placed himself among the foes of increase of value.

This present discussion has laid special stress on the simple numerical increase in values; but we must not forget that an increase in quantity is at the same time a heightening of quality and of intensity. What Paul has said about the spiritual body as compared to the earthly is an admirable illustration of this point. The movement from natural to spiritual is a movement from corruption to incorruption, from dishonor to glory, from weakness to power.

Yet in dwelling on the contrast in quality and intensity between the lower and the higher levels of life, we must beware not to overlook the continuity of the development. First the natural, then the spiritual. First the infant, then the growth into maturity. First confused sensation, hardly more than a

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

chaos; then a mind able to create poems, symphonies, dramas, philosophies, and utopias. The spirit is at work at every level and stage of existence. When we say that the natural is unspiritual we are wrong; the spirit is the energy at work in nature, but its purpose is not yet clear to us. The writer of Job expressed the immanence of spirit in nature most beautifully when he declared that "by his spirit he hath garnished the heavens."

In bringing this chapter to a close we are conscious that many important problems in connection with the development of spirit have not even been touched on their outermost fringes. In a treatment of the infinite development of spirit it would be most inappropriate to try to solve all problems, or even to say "the last word" on any problem. It is enough that doors may be opened showing new corridors to be explored. If spirit in man and the Divine Spirit are coworkers in the eternal development of value, if spirit is an eternal and inexhaustible creative energy, if the Eternal Spirit can help the human spirit to conquer or to find a way around every unspiritual obstacle, then life is forever the glorious adventure that the noblest and greatest human beings have taken it to be.

Testimony to the development of the spirit is to be

SPIRIT AS DEVELOPING

found in many places where one would not naturally look for it. Would one, offhand, expect to find lofty spirituality in a journal like *The New Yorker*? Yet the following poem by Ruth Lambert Jones appeared in its pages for May 10, 1941, and I am deeply indebted to Miss Jones and to the editor of *The New Yorker* for the privilege of presenting it as the climax of this chapter. The poem is entitled, "You Would Not Think."

You would not think
A chickadee
Could stir the branches
Of a tree.

You would not think
A little dog
Could shake a house
With his small jog.

You would not think
The step of man
Could dissipate
A bridge's span,

Or that his spirit
Could soar higher
Than bombers,
Pestilence, and fire.

CHAPTER VI

SPIRIT AS FREE

After the foregoing discussions, it is to be hoped that the reader is convinced that spirit is no vague term or "non-sense." When we say spirit we mean something. In the jargon of the semanticists, the term has a referent; but its referent is no single object, much less an object perceptible by the senses. Spirit is no one event or thing or experience; it is rather a rich and complex life of devotion to true values and of co-operation with divine purpose, as that purpose is apprehended by the spirit. The coming of the spirit is the coming of a new language, a new life, a whole new creation.

Since men have been aware that they were potential spirits, the life of spirit has been thought of as a life of freedom. The word freedom has, indeed, been for many centuries a word to thrill the heart of man more than has the word spirit. The Declaration of Independence is better named, as far as emotional response is concerned, than it would have

SPIRIT AS FREE

been under the title of The Declaration of Spirit. The Bill of Rights is a bill of the particulars of freedom. The liberal arts are the free arts. Students would not register in large numbers for the degree of bachelor of spiritual arts. Among the learned men of Europe, Milton had "been counted happy to be born in such a place of philosophic freedom, as they supposed England was." St. Paul boasted of "the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free." The writer of John's Gospel quotes Jesus as uttering the sublime words, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." It would seem weaker to the natural man had Jesus said, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you spiritual." The Funeral Oration of Pericles, reported by Thucydides, sets forth the freedom of Athens as having been achieved by men "who knew their duty and had the courage to do it, who in the hour of conflict had the fear of dishonor always present to them, and who, if ever they failed in an enterprise, would not allow their virtues to be lost to their country, but freely gave their lives to her as the fairest offering which they could present at her feast." The free life is the magnificent life. If spirit is great, it must be free.

Freedom is prized so highly that it seems as if men not only prize freedom more than they prize spirit,

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

but even reject spirit for freedom. They are as eager to defend the freedom to do wrong as they are to defend the freedom to do right; sometimes much more so. In wartime men will gladly fight for their freedom who in peacetime had not so much as heard that there was a free spirit. In wartime they will rally around God, and religion, and spirit, in so far as spirit may serve to help protect their freedom; but spirit in its essential nature is abhorrent to them. Or, to take another illustration, society seems to prize the freedom to consume alcoholic beverages far more than it prizes the spiritual dignity of man or the right of laborers—those potential spirits—to a living wage, which is the precondition of spiritual existence and development; and more than it prizes victory in war. Do you ask for evidence of this statement? The evidence is to be read in our newspapers and magazines, heard on our radios, experienced in our economic life, its advertising, its emotional enthusiasms, and its distribution of rewards. Spirits are more popular than spirit. The love of freedom, and of intemperate freedom, seems not only to surpass, but even to flout, all other ideals.

Whether this judgment is accurate or not, one thing is certain. When the love of freedom stands alone without support from the whole spiritual life,

SPIRIT AS FREE

freedom becomes an empty shell. The freedom to be lawless and uncontrolled, the freedom to be meaningless, in the end can turn out only in one way: it will become the freedom to destroy freedom. If freedom is not of the spirit, it is against the spirit; it is self-annihilating. "Me this unchartered freedom tires." Yet freedom is essential to spirit and is created by it. Let us examine the nature of freedom and of spirit to discover, if we may, their kinship.¹

I

It is crystal clear that not all uses of the word freedom designate anything spiritual. In fact, freedom is one of the most ambiguous words in any language.

The word may refer to a physical situation. Any object is free if nothing is holding it down or impeding its movements. More commonly we use the word of the movements of living organisms, in the sense just indicated. The animal caught in a trap, the human being in a wrecked automobile, the bound and gagged victim of a kidnaping, and the bird in a cage are not free. They cannot carry out their natural movements. Physical freedom, then means the absence of any obstacle to the natural

¹ The reader should consult the remarkable symposium edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen under the title *Freedom: Its Meaning* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1940).

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

movements of which a body is capable. The possession of physical freedom is no evidence of spirituality; the loss of physical freedom is no evidence of unspirituality. We may

See all things from pole to pole
And nod and glance and bustle by,
And never once possess our soul
Before we die.

On the other hand, a Pastor Niemöller may lose his physical freedom, while his spiritual freedom not only remains unimpaired, but increases in depth and power and influence.

If we turn from the physical to the psychological realm, we see that personal freedom may be either negative or positive. Negative freedom is the freedom of personal consciousness *from* whatever might impair its freedom, and positive freedom is the freedom of a person *to* achieve whatever is a suitable end for freedom.

First, then, what of negative personal freedom, freedom *from*? It is evident that it is analogous to physical freedom, for it relates to the absence of obstacles. Negative freedom may mean freedom of consciousness from external control or freedom from internal control. When the Second Isaiah called men to "come, buy wine and milk without money, and

SPIRIT AS FREE

without price," he was thinking of the negative freedom of the spirit. The spirit is free from economic compulsions, just as Niemöller is free from political compulsions. One cannot buy or sell the spirit; it is free from dependence on the external. Karl Marx's theory of historical materialism, in its worst moods, overlooks the truth that unless spirit possesses at least negative freedom there is no hope for any successful revolt against intolerable conditions. The old Stoics doubtless exaggerated the doctrine of negative freedom in their maxim of the independence of externals; they held, as is well known, that there is no reason for the will to be affected in any way by anything which is external to it. To quote Epictetus:

I must die; must I, then, die groaning too? I must be fettered; and wailing too? I must go into exile; does anyone, then, keep me from going with a smile, and cheerful and serene? "Tell your secrets." I say not a word; for this is under my control. "But I will fetter you." What is that you say, man? Fetter *me*? My leg you will fetter, but my moral purpose not even Zeus himself has power to overcome. "I will throw you into prison." My paltry body, rather. "I will behead you." Well, when did I ever tell you that mine was the only neck that could not be severed? ²

It may be that Epictetus expects too much of human

²From *Arrian's Discourses of Epictetus*, I, 1, 21-24, as translated by W. A. Oldfather in the Loeb Classical Library.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

nature; but after all, what he taught he practiced, slave as he was. He asked no more than that men should manifest for the sake of spiritual values that same courage and disregard of externals which the soldier shows in battle, whether his cause be good or evil. In this sense, negative freedom is a magnificent positive achievement. —

There is another view of the spirit, however, which makes its negative freedom something far less active than Epictetus' independence of externals. We have from time to time had occasion to reflect on the thought of George Santayana, a sincere and brilliant thinker, yet one who seems to have missed insight into the true aim of spirit. Whenever he thinks of spiritual freedom, as in the chapter on "Liberation" in *The Realm of Spirit* (his latest work), he thinks of it as an experience which frees us from the whole world. Spiritual freedom, for him, is escape; it is "a transport beyond distraction," as he puts it. The life of the spirit, on his view, lies in the contemplation of frail and lovely essences that have no real existence, but simply appear as visions before the mind in its intuitions. The spirit, he thinks, lives the life of a bird in a gilded cage. Such freedom as it knows is forgetfulness of existence, its responsibilities and its tragedies. This is the mock freedom of a

SPIRIT AS FREE

narcotized life. Epictetus had a very different view. He preferred to face existence, to judge it, and to find it powerless against a good will. Instead, Santayana disregards existence, and would have the spirit enjoy its essences in a realm free from all thoughts of the practical. Even the hedonistic Epicurus saw more deeply than Santayana; he said that "if you would enjoy real freedom, you must be the slave of philosophy." But *real* freedom can never ensue from a philosophy that seeks escape from the *real* world. The yearning to escape is a pit into which Hegel himself, the interpreter of the real course of history and nature, was in grave danger of falling. He confessed that he sought in philosophy escape "from the weary strife of passions that agitate the surface of society into the calm region of contemplation." Not escape, but control and use is the higher aim of spirit. Contemplation affords at best but negative freedom.

Negative freedom is not exhausted in the idea of freedom from control by external, physical forces. For negative personal freedom to be complete, the direction of life must also be free from control by involuntary inner forces, "the weary strife of passions" of which Hegel spoke. It is a commonplace observation that most of our conscious experience is

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

sheer brute fact, not produced by our wills nor capable of being altered by our wills. Our sensory experiences are not determined so much by our choice as by our environment and our sense organs. Freedom cannot rid us of sensations; it can only direct them. Our life's aims, our experiments, our inquiries, and our decisions are determined in many cases by our choice, our deliberate selection from among available possibilities. There freedom rules. Inner negative personal freedom operates when we make our choices without being deterred by fears, complexes, inhibitions, or tabus. If our emotional life intrudes into our decisions in such a way that we are, or think we are, prevented from choosing definitely what we have deliberately decided on in our thoughtful moments, then we have lost our negative freedom. When any force or combination of forces within the mind, other than the person's own voluntary choice, causes one to act, he has no negative freedom. He is not master in his own house; he has been mastered. Negative freedom is no small thing. It is a minimum essential to the spiritual life; but, though necessary, it is not sufficient.

Let us imagine a situation in which there is physical freedom—the natural movements of the body are not restricted by hindering forces. In this same situ-

SPIRIT AS FREE

ation let us also suppose that there is negative personal freedom—the spirit makes its decisions without being overpowered by inner emotional oppositions. In this situation, is the spirit truly free? Perhaps it is as free as many men ever become, but still it is quite lacking in the essence of spiritual freedom. At best it has only a part of its essence.

Positive personal freedom is far more important than any form of negative freedom, physical or personal. By positive personal freedom is meant the power to achieve chosen objectives. In this sense, freedom is a fusion of two powers, the power to choose and the power to achieve. The power to choose is doubtless the more fundamental of the two; Driesch defines freedom in terms of choice, which he describes as the power to say yes or no. Yet if freedom were no more than a yes-and-no exercise, it would be empty and formal. If a person could say yes, and his yes were to leave the world in all respects exactly as it was before, without altering anyone's responses or changing the pattern of anything, spiritual freedom would then be a barren phrase. Spiritual development, if we could speak of it at all, would be no more than reiteration of Stoic independence of externals. Such restriction is social futility. In a world of persons, socially related, inter-

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

dependent, and aiming at shared values, freedom of choice is a ghostly shadow unless accompanied by some degree of freedom of achievement. The spiritual value of freedom hinges on the extent to which the free man can, in some sense, not only choose a better world, but actually remake this one. Freedom in the spiritual sense is creative in that it aims at co-operative action which shall bring into being a new social state of affairs.

Positive spiritual freedom, in this sense, is the labor and toil of achieving objectives in at least five fields: the field of personal consciousness, the organism, the natural environment, society, and the divine environment. Without examining the complex interrelations of these fields, let us consider each as an arena for freedom.

Properly enough, freedom, like charity, begins at home. The first task of positive freedom is the re-making of the person's own conscious life. This involves the suppression of the irrelevant, the choice of the worthy and rational, and the planned organization of experience. Here is the root of all spirituality. It is true freedom. Nevertheless, it is on a low plane unless the mind is endowed with enough imagination for it to think of various possible courses of action and to select from among them, freely and

SPIRIT AS FREE

rationally, the best that is available and practicable. The primary function of spiritual freedom is illustrated when consciousness remakes itself, selecting from and judging its sense data, its emotions and its desires, and determining its goal.

The task of positive freedom is not confined to the subjective remaking of personality by itself. In fact, that task could never be carried out in any intelligent or effective way unless, secondly, the free mind turned its attention outward toward the organism which is the physical basis of life. If the mind is to be usefully and adequately free, the mind must know its body, must understand the powers and limitations of the body, and must direct it toward health and efficiency. Without control of the body, the range and the results of spiritual freedom are painfully hampered. And, thirdly, the freedom of the personality and of control of the organism require for their field of operation the natural environment. Our working knowledge of the physical world and its laws is itself an achievement of freedom and must be used by freedom if the organism is to survive and the spiritual life is to come to vital expression.

Thus far we have spoken as though there were only the person, its body, and the physical world; but, fourthly, from the start there is a society of per-

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

sons, and a very large proportion of the ends which freedom seeks for the fulfillment of its spiritual needs is attainable only by co-operation with others. To choose shared values is futile unless we can freely elicit the co-operation of others in the sharing of those values. Without knowledge of others, we are not free to love; without response from others, we can never build free institutions. Art and literature, religion and philosophy, science itself, are all products of free social action. But fifthly, religion (or any spiritual value) is no mere social or natural or biological or individual product. It is a product of the free co-operation of the Divine Spirit with human spirits. Without free action on both sides, the human and the divine, genuine spiritual religion does not occur. If God is mere mechanism, or man is mere passive recipient, religion is not a personal experience but an illusory mechanical trick.

Something of the ambiguity of the word freedom and of the complex nature of the task of freedom have been revealed in this survey of the many-sided meanings of the word.

II

We are now ready for a more exact analysis of the nature of spiritual freedom.

SPIRIT AS FREE

As we have seen, the experience of choice is a fundamental spiritual fact that is essential to any real freedom. Many strange misunderstandings have arisen in the course of discussions of freedom. It is often said that freedom of choice implies freedom to choose anything whatever, regardless of past experience. This is, of course, on the face of it absurd. Choice is, to repeat Driesch's formula, saying yes or no to what is given. When we choose, we select from the available. The available is determined by past experience and present conditions. The given cannot be arbitrarily created or destroyed. You cannot choose to sing in an opera unless many previous conditions have been fulfilled: your native endowment, your study of music, your voice training, your knowledge of opera. If these conditions are fulfilled, you are then free to seek membership in the cast of some opera company. If you are accepted, your freedom experiences at once a new fulfillment and a new limitation—a fulfillment, because you have gained your end; a limitation, because henceforth you are not free to sing any parts in any opera you may elect, but you have to take the part assigned you by the director. Within those limits your freedom consists in singing the part as well as you possibly can. You bend all your energies toward excellence in the role.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

At every moment your freedom is freedom within limits, and the limits are determined by forces which your will cannot change. Your freedom finds its highest realization by choosing the best means to achieve its ends within the given limits. Such freedom is an inner act, where the person is supreme. There is no known or possible method of teaching music or religion or philosophy or character which will compel a person to exert himself to the utmost in the direction of excellence. As is music, so is the spiritual life as a whole. No freedom, no music. In its exercise of freedom, spiritual life is a personal achievement. It is an experience of the inner life in the strictest sense of the word. The spiritual man must choose.

The extreme of unspirituality occurs when a person is so indifferent to life and to values that he will not exert himself to make any choice. He allows circumstances to choose for him. He takes no interest; hence other and often sinister interests take him and use him as their tool. Satan finds work for idle hands to do. This occurs most often when men become, as we say, desperate, and lose hope and faith and interest. In such unspiritual soil the seeds of fascism and totalitarianism have taken root and grown into giant disorders of the world's mind. The

SPIRIT AS FREE

Second World War may likewise provide evil soil for many of America's youth. Only if the spirit reaffirms the reality of free choice can the results of such unspiritual calamities be overcome.

As has already been intimated, freedom of choice, important as it is, is an insufficient account of freedom. We have said that there must also be some measure of freedom for desirable achievements. Choice is good, but it is not good enough. Choice must be accompanied by action, and by action that is wise and fruitful. Freedom's eyes are blind without rationality. Freedom that is irrational may destroy both itself and others; too often it destroys the others long before it destroys itself. However long or short the process, irrational freedom is the end of all freedom. If choice is the first factor, rationality is the second factor in spiritual freedom. Without rationality freedom is irresponsible, ruthless, egoistic, and ruinous.

Spirit means rationality; that is to say, it means a search for wholeness. Rationality is completeness and consistency; spirituality is a life of harmony, unity, and integration. The spiritual man is the rational man. This statement disturbs some, because the rational man is pictured by them as cold and calculating, spending all his time in the spinning

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

out of syllogisms. Yet, in the fullest sense of the words, such a man is as irrational as he is unspiritual. He is not seeking the full and highest truth about his own nature and the nature of his fellow men; he is concentrating on limited and lower phases of personality. It is never either rational or spiritual to substitute a part for the whole, or to choose the lower when we can have the higher. If we do not love the Lord our God with all our mind, we are neither spiritual nor rational. To love anyone with part of our mind is unsatisfactory to all concerned. Spirituality and rationality are one in their demand for adequate coherence of life; their only difference is that the spiritual man dwells on the experience of coherence, while the rational man is more concerned to test, explain, and verify it.

Without rational devotion to truth, freedom of choice becomes license and license becomes bondage. Irrational freedom rests on the maxim, "I have a right to do as I please, and take the consequences." Yet when one does as he pleases, without any thought about the rationality of what he pleases, the consequences rapidly create limits to his freedom, limits which restrict his field of choice, his power of action, and his capacity for growth. Freedom that disregards reason and truth can soon reduce a person to a

SPIRIT AS FREE

thing, staggering mechanically without powers of self-control or self-direction. As the ancient Syrian essayist, Lucian, well remarked, such freedom makes one a plaything of the stronger force; and strong forces do not always play gently.

What is the alternative to rationality? The only alternative is whimsicality. We must either choose for reasons or choose without them. Choice without reasons is whimsicality. The whim of the individual plays in his life the same role that the arbitrary will of an autocratic dictator plays in society. Whims victimize the soul, as the dictator victimizes his subjects. By acting on our whims, we may manifest what we think is power, but what turns out to be folly. Irrational whims yield no better harvest than arbitrary and planless sowing of seed would yield in a garden. Some flowers may spring up, but the garden as a whole will become a jungle. To suppose that the absence of any rational consideration on our part is likely to open our life to the Divine Spirit is to suppose that the Divine Charioteer would rather drive a wild and untamed horse than an intelligent and obedient one. Without our co-operation, even God the Eternal cannot save us.

Spiritual freedom, then, must include both freedom of choice, as we have said, and free rationality.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

It must also include a certain degree of opportunity. Freedom is not wholly a matter of choice. We are spiritually freer on the mountains or prairie or ocean than we are likely to be in the slums or on the battlefield. Just so we are freer in a democracy than in an autocracy. Freedom is a barren possession if, being free, we can find nothing at hand that is worth choosing. It is one thing to give a starving man his freedom in a restaurant, and quite another to give him his freedom on the desert. In both cases freedom of a sort is possible; in both cases it is noble. But it is, to say the least, more rewarding in the restaurant. Spiritual freedom requires the availability of values to choose. Spiritual freedom is not only freedom to aspire, but also freedom to climb. Spiritual freedom, in the absence of heights that may be scaled, is an empty gift. It cheapens freedom. A God who gave nothing for freedom to gain would be an unworthy God.

The name that religion gives to the availability of values is the grace of God, yet the most generous gifts of God's grace may be at least temporarily frustrated by man's sin and greed. God, as we have seen, cannot achieve his gracious purposes without human co-operation, both individual and social. Lack of human co-operation rather than any lack in divine

SPIRIT AS FREE

grace is what reduces freedom of choice to an empty boon. The pitiable citizens of occupied France and the much more pitiable Greeks still have freedom of choice, yet their real freedom is reduced to the vanishing point. Man's inhumanity to man has taken away their freedom to cultivate and express their religious faith, or their artistic aspirations, or their intellectual life, or their political self-respect.

A spiritual universe is one in which the truly desirable is eventually available. An unspiritual universe, or an unspiritual social order, is one in which individuals are offered no opportunity to choose a satisfactory lot for themselves. In a spiritual order there is opportunity to achieve truth and beauty, goodness and love, joy and reverence.

We may sum up the essence of spiritual freedom by saying that true freedom is personal unity. The person can be a unity only when by his choice he decides to be rational and to seek to make the most of the best opportunities that are at hand, or that he can find. Personal unity apart from spiritual achievement is a mere name for the fact that a self can remember what it has been and done. Many a self, unfortunately, can remember no more than a phantasmagoria of cross-purposes, indecisions, and frustrations, mingled with poisonous pleasures. Pur-

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

poseless and undirected choices may all belong to one person, but the oneness of such a person is no spiritual unity. In the spiritual sense, personal unity is a life in which every experience helps and builds every other experience, in which the clash of desires is conquered and harmony and peace prevail.

The Greeks expressed this ideal negatively by the word *apatheia* (apathy), meaning freedom from emotion; and the Hindus and Buddhists may have had something like it in mind when they have spoken of Nirvana. One level of unity can thus be reached through the eradication of all emotional life. In contrast, the Christian spiritual ideal is far richer and more positive than any negative achievement. It is expressed in such words as *eirene* (peace) and *agape* (love). Christian peace and love are not the extermination of man's purposes and strivings and emotions, but are rather the directing of them toward his God and toward his fellow man. The unspiritual man is always embarrassed and distressed in the presence of the highest ideals. The thought of God confuses and annoys him, not because he finds it false but because it is beyond him. He is troubled, because he is not free to reach God. His life has not become a unity. His higher aspirations are crowded out or hushed by the clamor of his lower desires. His

SPIRIT AS FREE

soul is an arena of warring impulses, not their master. But the spiritual man is free to be his complete best, while the unspiritual man is unfree. Nietzsche has said that men are either masters or slaves. He is right. The spiritual man is masterly. The unspiritual man is slavish. The spiritual man, let us add, is master only because he seeks and takes the highest opportunities. He is master of himself and of circumstance because he is a slave of God, like Paul, Christ's slave; and such a man is never slavish.

III

In carrying out the principles of spiritual freedom as we have discovered them, we soon meet problems in relating spiritual freedom to that personal liberty which is so dear to all believers in democracy. Personal liberty is related to, but not identical with, spiritual freedom. Personal liberty becomes a destructive principle if it be taken to mean unrestricted freedom of choice without any appeal to reason. No democracy, no government of any kind, could give its citizens unlimited liberty to do as they please, any more than a mind could give free rein to every whim and fancy and still retain its sanity. Such liberty would be anarchy. It could result only in a war of all against all, which Hobbes took to be man's nat-

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

ural state; and it is natural enough, in the sense of being unspiritual. As a social being, man needs spirituality. Freedom to do as I please must rise at least to the level of freedom to do as I think best before it can serve as basis for responsible living. "As I think best." Both the word "think" and the word "best" must be emphasized. A man who cannot and will not think at all cannot live in society. He can neither drive a car nor escape with his life as a pedestrian; much less can he make out an income tax return or cast an intelligent ballot. Thought is a prerequisite to the right of personal liberty. I am not free and cannot be granted freedom unless to some extent I think. I am truly free only when I genuinely *think*. Further, I am exercising true liberty only when I choose what I think *best*. Freedom is given us by God and by society for the common good. We should use it to "test the spirits," compare values, and select each day "the best of all possible worlds" for that day. Spiritual freedom is therefore the goal and standard for personal liberty. If a free person, seeking personal liberty, rejects spiritual freedom and prefers unspiritual freedom, he is destroying the very foundations of his liberty. There can be no right to destroy right, no liberty to destroy liberty. This is the law of the spirit.

SPIRIT AS FREE

Devotion to personal liberty without spiritual freedom is one of the great sources of evil in our modern civilization. To take a trivial, yet typical illustration, it was recorded in the daily press that a youth wrote to Dorothy Dix seeking advice. It seems that he wanted a wife, but he found that the young ladies of his acquaintance were not satisfied with him as he was; they earnestly desired him to change some of his personal habits. That, he complained, was his difficulty. He had reached the age of twenty-two, and his personal habits were settled. He sought a young woman who would not expect him to change any of his habits at all. It is evident that this youth wanted nothing of spiritual freedom, or rationality, or opportunity for growth and betterment, from his marriage. He wanted a perpetuation of the *status quo* in himself. The desire to be married and to make no changes in one's personal habits is not only an irrational desire, but also an unattainable one. The bride and the law of cause and effect would take care of that. This case, we have said, is typical. The young man wished to have what he wanted without rational adjustment to the facts; he wanted to have an opportunity without meeting the only terms on which that opportunity was available. He wanted to be free, yet to be irrational. It is such

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

desires for the impossible that create human wretchedness on a far larger scale than that young man's little soul was capable of suffering.

There is no freedom in seeking power without responsibility. Nietzsche defined his Superman as "Caesar with the soul of Christ," that is, power with noble purpose and great love. An unspiritual age seeks personal liberty and power without any soul at all; and history is now proving on a vast scale that any kind of Caesarism without Christ is the suicide of humanity. The race yearns again and again to try the experiment of Dorothy Dix's correspondent and seek fulfillment of its desires without changing its habits. There is no freedom by this road. The attempt of a passion to free itself from rational guidance, the attempt of a person to defy other persons, the attempt of a race to dominate other races, the attempt of man to stifle the God-given aspirations of his spirit—all of these are of the same piece. They are fool's gold; they are the struggle for a false and illusory freedom; they are attempts of the spirit to deny its nature as spirit. Spirit cannot be free unless it is free as spirit. The crisis through which civilization is now passing is also a spiritual opportunity, since it is ruthlessly destroying the personal habits of a large part of the human race. It there-

SPIRIT AS FREE

fore presents the possibility, on a grand scale, of re-making human habits on a new and higher level than before, while at the same time offering to freedom the choice of descent to still lower levels.

It would be very unrealistic to leave the topic of spiritual freedom and personal liberty without pointing out the bearing of spiritual freedom on economic life. We are often told that the present economic order is essentially democratic; in fact, it is said that as democracy is based on freedom, so the capitalistic system is based on freedom. From this it is inferred that any restrictions on the freedom to seek profits is undemocratic and slavish. Much that has been written on the subject has been so idealistic and remote from the facts as to be worthless except as an emotional relief to the writers. If we look at the facts, it is incorrect to say that the capitalistic system as we have developed it in the modern world is an expression of freedom. The capitalistic system has done enormous good; it has been a great advance on what the world had previously seen; and when administered by high-minded Christians has at times resulted in almost ideal relations between labor and capital. Nevertheless, it is false to say that it is fundamentally a system of liberty. If it were what the laissez-faire writers took it to be, then anyone would be free to

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

start up in business at any time; and if only he was honest, industrious, and able, he would succeed. Over against this theory, the fact is that, for the overwhelming majority, there is no freedom at all to found a business; for very many there is no freedom even to find any employment other than the employment artificially created by that dire instrument of man's inhumanity to man which we call war. The fiction that the unemployed are in that state because of their incompetence and lack of thrift is very exalting to the successful. Such exaltation rests on an insecure foundation. The slightest reflection on the causes of success ought to deflate that ego at once. To a large extent success is due to accidents of birth, of environment, of influential friends, of social standing. Merit without opportunity or friends does not lead uniformly to a success story.

An economic order in which merit is always rewarded and freedom always finds opportunity would be very different from our present order—not merely from the order in wartime or from the so-called New Deal, but different from anything we have yet dared to try. The spiritual man will not be concerned to preserve the incomes of the privileged classes at their present levels. He will be concerned to seek an

SPIRIT AS FREE

order of society in which spiritual freedom can be achieved.

It is not our purpose at the moment to undertake to describe such an order; it is our purpose merely to point out the spiritual standards by which any order should be judged. The order in which we have been living has not been a spiritual order. It is falling about our ears, say what we will. Perhaps it is falling because it was not spiritual—because it did not respect the freedom of men to become spiritual. The new day that lies ahead must, indeed, be a day of greater security; but if it is not also a day of greater opportunity for all men of all races than our day has been, it will contain the seeds of its own destruction. Neither security nor personal liberty—whether for some or for all—is worth having unless there is spiritual liberty, the opportunity for all to choose and experience the highest values of which man is capable.

IV

We have seen that discussion of the principles of choice and of rationality has led us to acknowledge the principle of opportunity. We have seen that discussion of personal liberty has compelled us to face the nature of economic liberty. Let us now face

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

more explicitly the problem of political liberty, in its relations to spiritual freedom.

True religion teaches us that freedom is found only in complete obedience to the will of God, which defines for us the conditions of the highest opportunity. Freedom without co-operation and submission is anarchy. From these truths it is possible to draw untrue conclusions. This is done by one of the world's greatest thinkers, the philosopher Hegel. Seeing that the meaning of man's life depends on the whole to which he belongs, Hegel defines freedom in terms of our membership in and submission to the state. "We are free," he says, "when we recognize the law and follow it as the substance of our own being."³ Over against this saying of Hegel's we may set an aphorism, ascribed to a British judge, to the effect that a man who remains always strictly within the limits of the law may be neither a decent neighbor nor an honest man. Hegel is perfectly consistent when he infers from his premise that the state is the march of God in the world, but his theory takes insufficient account of the fact that there are evil states. He does, it is true, admit their existence, especially in his "addition" to paragraph 258 of the *Philosophy of Right*, where he grants that a state may be "evil"

³ From *Philosophy of History*, Jubiläumsausgabe, XI, 71.

SPIRIT AS FREE

or "defective." In fact, he goes so far as to compare some states to "the ugliest man, the criminal, the diseased, and the cripple." However, he dwells on the fact that these men are all living human beings, and points out that this affirmative principle is far more important than their defects. We must grant that Hegel is right in holding that every man owes a debt to the social and political organism which sustains and protects him, and that he owes it even to an evil state. Yet we cannot grant that man's freedom consists in his obedience to the state, whether it be good or evil. We cannot even grant that man's freedom consists in his obedience to a wholly good state. His freedom has a higher source than any state or political constitution, and arises from his nature as potential spirit. It is just as necessary to judge the state by the standards of spirit as it is to judge the individual by those standards. True liberty exists only where spiritual standards are guiding principles and only where the state and its acts are held accountable at the bar of spiritual judgment. Man's highest freedom, then, is not achieved by obedience to the laws of the state, but by obedience to the laws of the spirit. The responsible person guided by spiritual ideals will in almost every case obey the laws of the state; but it is the great tradi-

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

tion of democracy to recognize the dignity and the rights of the man who, living by the laws of the spirit, cannot obey every demand of the state.

Most attempts to secure political welfare and liberty have been so much dominated by the desire for security in the social order as to subordinate spiritual to political freedom, or at least to subject it to rigorous regimentation. In democracy, however, we have a form of government which trusts the spirit in man; hence democracy is the only form of government which provides (by process of constitutional amendment) for its own overthrow. Yet democracy dares to run that risk, because, consciously or unconsciously, the founders of this type of government have recognized that the cause of democracy is the cause of the spirit, and that the cause of the human spirit is the cause of the Divine Spirit. This does not mean that the Constitution of the United States is the constitution of the kingdom of heaven, but it does mean that the principle of freedom in one is akin to the principle of freedom in the other.

There are those who object to the idea that Christianity is essentially democratic. They point to the aristocratic forms of government under which Christianity long flourished. They show that Plato, that great Christian before Christianity, was an aristocrat,

SPIRIT AS FREE

and that democracy arose in Greece, was opposed by Plato, and did not develop under Christianity for centuries. These arguments, plausible as they are, suffer from the assumption that the holders of a religion will promptly see and carry out the principles implicit in that religion. It is Christianity that taught the worth of the individual soul, the refusal to put the claims of any Caesar above the claims of God, and the responsibility of men to develop just economic relations. These principles are democratic. It is true that a Christian democracy will behave very differently from an unchristian democracy; but it is also true that any fundamentally undemocratic form of government gives to some men a power over other men that rightly belongs only to God.

It is, however, of the utmost importance, especially in times when the fate of democracy is trembling in the balance, to remind ourselves that democracy rests on spiritual and Christian foundations. If the members of a society repudiate spiritual values, their political freedom becomes a freedom to undermine the foundations of personal achievement, the opportunity for spiritual growth, and the conditions of secure social existence. If a democracy is to endure, it must place the spirit above the letter, God above Caesar, and spiritual conscience above civil law.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

When plagued by the persecutions of Domitian at the end of the first century, the Christian church made its decision; and that decision was to take spiritual freedom as the test of every other kind of freedom. From concentration camps and martyrs' blocks, the church repeated the words of that great document of spiritual freedom, the Book of Revelation, that "the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ." That ideal is the root principle of democracy.

Hence religious liberty, and nonreligious liberty too, are cornerstones of democracy. Take them away, and you have destroyed democracy. Leave them, and theoretically you may argue that democracy is in danger, but in its hour of danger it will have enlisted on its side the might of the free spirit in man and in God. Is this too naïve a view? Does it overlook the fact—the supposed fact—that the freedom of the spirit is a mere figment if it is not based on military victory? No; on the contrary, those who believe that freedom can be secured for the spirit by military victory alone are the naïve ones, who do not learn from history. As a matter of cold, realistic fact, the outcome of any war and of its post-war world depends on the spirit far more than the fate of the spirit depends on the war. If the fanatical

SPIRIT AS FREE

faith of a Hitler could rise from poverty and imprisonment in a period of twenty years to heights of terrible power, who can doubt that truly spiritual faith can move greater mountains than Hitler ever moved?

Political liberty can be secured and maintained only where spiritual liberty is secured and maintained. Military victory without spiritual liberty means spiritual defeat, and spiritual defeat is the defeat of freedom.

V

From the very start of this book we have been concerned with the varied forms in which spirit manifests itself. We have seen that there have been wild and unrestrained activities that have been called spiritual. From medicine men and witches down to the fanatical and superstitious sects of today, spiritual life has had a seamy side. Man's desire to rise above the dull routine of trivial daily existence and to find sources of power and exaltation has led him to extravagant excesses. As the book has advanced, we have laid more and more stress on the ideal aims of spiritual life in its highest forms. Yet we must not forget that all striving for values is a form of spirituality, even when it is perverted. Every actual spirit

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

is a member of the realm of spirit—good spirits, evil spirits, irresponsible spirits. The spirit of our times, our own *Zeitgeist*, is a spirit. Its awe-inspiring evil and its desperate struggle for good are evidence, if any were needed, of the tragic consequences which must accompany free spirit in its development, precisely on account of its freedom.

The freedom of spirit means that it is not forced into any straight line of advance. Free spirit experiments. It faces new possibilities and is undeterred by perils in exploring the various paths that present themselves to its consideration. It moves dialectically, from extreme to extreme, until it finds some way of reconciling its opposing tensions and a new level of life is reached. The first half of the twentieth century is a period of greater tension and struggle than the human race has ever seen. Our *Zeitgeist* is the Spirit of Struggle; we might almost call it the twin Spirits of Holy War and Unholy War, War of the Spirit and War of the Flesh. It exemplifies Hegel's dialectic on a grand scale.

We had a democracy in many countries, but a democracy in unstable equilibrium, not sure of itself, not able to solve its domestic or its foreign problems in the spirit of true democracy. The haves did not know how to deal with the have-nots. The have-

SPIRIT AS FREE

nots have taken their revenge, and the end is not yet. In a great spiritual insight, Hegel said that the very idea of the love of God sinks to triviality when "the seriousness, the pain, the patience, and the labor of the negative" are missing from our experience. By the negative Hegel means everything that is left out, the whole area of have-nots. The negative is the lost sheep and the lost son, the sharecroppers, the unemployed, the Germans in the days of the Weimar Republic who looked in vain for justice from the rest of the world, the forgotten man everywhere. To consider the negative is indeed labor and pain, but the alternative is forced on us. Either we face the negative and try to cope with it intelligently and unselfishly, or else we neglect it until it rises and rends us.

Our age has been choosing the method of neglect on a large scale. It has lacked the spiritual courage and imagination to seek a reconciling solution. The result is that the spirit of the negative has entered into a world struggle. The have-nots are arrayed against the haves. The strife of spirits is not merely on the battlefield; it is in every nation and in every breast. The seriousness of the negative, neglected, has made itself felt. Everywhere there is the struggle between the spirit of tyranny and the spirit of

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

freedom, between the spirit of blind power and the spirit of truth. Yet we must not forget that both spirits in the world struggle are spiritual powers, and that both are pervasive. No laws, no armed force, and no censorship can keep the spirit of freedom utterly away from the souls of men; nor can such forces keep the spirit of tyranny away, either. The battle is in the spirit, of the spirit, for the spirit.

The sum of the whole matter is this: The decision for the future of the spirit of man lies with the free spirit and not with the tyrannical spirit. Tyranny can prevail only if it appeals to freedom. No tyranny can wholly crush freedom. Nothing can take away man's longing for the highest values, or his loyalty to them. No totalitarians, no wars, no fears, famines, or perils of any kind can really break a man's spirit, until he breaks it himself by surrendering. Tyranny has many dread powers, but not the power to rule the spirit. The refusal to break or to yield, the will to loyalty, cannot be created or destroyed by any political or military or physical powers. The spiritual life, rooted in the Divine Spirit, is the source of the importance or unimportance of everything in the visible world. The good spirit, being the earthly messenger from the Divine Spirit, is bound to triumph over all that is unspiritual and

SPIRIT AS FREE

evil. The spiritual life is indeed a life of struggle, but it is also a life of well-grounded hope. Hope is grounded in freedom, and freedom is grounded in all the high purposes and powers of spirit, human and divine. The last word of spirit is Victory.

INDEX

- Agape*, 196
 Agnosticism, 110
 Anabaptists, 70
 Anshen, R. N., 179n.
 Anthropology, 107
Apatheia, 196
 Aquinas, Thomas, 147
 Aristotle, 27, 28, 119, 147, 149, 150,
 153, 154; Pure Form, 143
 Astronomy, 107
 Augustine, St., 16, 78, 147
 Axiogenesis, 168
 Axiosoteria, 168

 Baldwin, J. M., 88
 Barth, Karl, 152, 153
 Beauty, as spiritual value, 113,
 155-57
Begriff, 38
 Behaviorism, 133
 Berdyaev, Nicolas, 16
 Berkeley, George, 16, 23, 39
 Biology, 107
 Bosanquet, Bernard, 100
 Bowman, A. A., 91
 Bowne, B. P., 62
 Buckham, J. W., 17
 Buddhists, 196
 Bunyan, John, 52
 Burns, C. D., 9
 Burrows, Millar, 21

 Calvin, John, 172, 173
 Capitalistic system, 201, 202

 Chanter, W. G., 21
 Chemistry, 107, 132
 Christianity: democratic, 206, 207;
 essential meaning of, 149; as
 spiritual religion, 35
 Church, example of Objective
 Spirit, 94-99
 Clough, A. H., 114
 Coherence, ideal of, 116
 Communism, 51
 Comte, Auguste, 101
 Consciousness: divine, 72, 73; fam-
 ily, 90; human, 72-77; individ-
 ual, 79-83; national, 93, 94; so-
 cial, 71-77
 Constitution, United States, 206

Daimonion, 44
 Darwin, Charles, 145
 Declaration of Independence, 176
 Demiurge, Platonic, 152
 Democracy, 9, 194, 197, 201, 206-8,
 210
 Demons, 44
 Dewey, John, 102, 110n.
 Dix, Dorothy, 199, 200
 Domitian, 208
 Driesch, Hans, 185, 189
 Duhm, Bernhard, 163

 Economic order, 201-3
Eirene, 196
 Emerson, R. W., 58
 Epictetus, 181-83

INDEX

Epicurus, 183
 Ethics, science of, 107
 Eucken, Rudolf, 16, 25, 127

Faith, 137, 138, 140, 148
 Family, 89-93
 Fox, George, 15
 Freedom, 176-88; negative, 180-84;
 physical, 179, 180, 184; positive
 personal, 185-87; spirit as ex-
 perience of, 30-33; spiritual,
 188-201

Geistesleben, 127
 Ghosts, 12, 48, 56
 God: define, 11; grace of, 194; im-
 manent in all development, 149-
 54; kingdom of, 163; love of, 25,
 72; mind of, 123-25; as personal
 power, 132; as personal spirit,
 132, 134; personality of, 76, 77;
 social, 72; Spirit of, 21, 128
 Goethe, 163
 Goodness, as spiritual value, 155-
 57
 Green, T. H., 56

Hadfield, J. A., 21
 Hartmann, Nicolai, 16
 Hegel, 16, 26, 31-33, 35, 38, 70, 75,
 145, 146, 153, 154, 166, 183, 204,
 205, 210, 211; Objective Spirit,
 48-52, 87-99
 Heraclitus, 35, 134, 146
 Hindus, 196
 Hobbes, Thomas, 197
 Höfding, Harald, 48, 168, 169
 Homer, 28
 Humanism, 106-10
 Humanity, 101, 102
 Hume, David, 103
 Huxley, Julian, 105, 106, 137

Ideals: objective, 117-25; as re-
 lated to values, 67, 68, 118
 Individuality, 79-83

James, William, 43, 83
 Jefferson, Thomas, 32
 Jesus, 17, 18, 22, 26, 35, 42, 45, 47,
 53, 63, 162, 169, 170, 177
 John Bull, 51
 John, St., 16, 25, 169, 177
 Jones, R. L., 175
 Jones, R. M., 15, 16
 Justin Martyr, 35

Kagawa, Toyohiko, 15
 Kant, 30, 31, 148, 151
 Kierkegaard, Søren, 143, 152, 153
 King, H. C., 16
Kleinmenschlich, 25, 127
 Knudson, A. C., 29n.
 Koehler, Wolfgang, 60

League of Nations, 94, 97
 LeBon, Gustave, 35
 Leibniz, G. W., 80
 Leuba, J. H., 47, 48
 Liberty: personal, 197-203; politi-
 cal, 204-9; religious, 208, 209
 Lincoln, Abraham, 32
 Locke, John, 147
 Logos, 34, 35
 Love, as spiritual value, 112, 113,
 155, 157, 158
 Lucian, 193

Marx, Karl, 90, 145, 181
 Materialism, 91
 Matter, 92, 93
 Maximilla, 13
 Milton, John, 177
 Montanus, 13, 14; Montanism, 14,
 18, 70
 Mudge, James, 155

INDEX

Müller, G. E., 50

Mystery, 131-33

Mystics, 83, 84

Nation, spiritualizing of, 93, 94

Nazism, 51, 100, 101

Niemöller, Martin, 30, 50, 180, 181

Nietzsche, Friedrich, 53, 87, 145, 200

Nirvana, 196

Objective Spirit, Hegel's, 48-52, 87-99

Objectivity, 106, 109, 110, 117, 121-23

Paraclete, of St. John's Gospel, 13

Parmenides, 142, 146

Parshley, H. M., 105, 106

Paul, St., 9, 12, 13, 16, 22, 26, 29, 65, 78, 79, 84, 87, 95, 135, 148, 162, 163, 169-72, 197

Person: Eternal, 134, 135; as self, 60, 61

Personality: mystery of, 132-34; in relation to spirit, 41-55; spirit dependent on, 55-58; superhuman, 164-67

Philosophy, spiritual, 24

Physics, 107, 117, 132

Physiology, 107

Plato, 16, 25, 26, 28, 29, 34, 42, 43, 55, 102, 143, 206, 207

Platonic Ideas, 54, 55, 112, 143, 145, 151, 152, 154

Pneuma, 14, 15; *pneuma zoes*, 42

Pneumatics, 14, 17

Positivism, 110

Potentiality, 59-64

Prisca, 13

Psychology, 107, 133

Pythagoras, 142

Quaker "concern," 46

Rationality, 191-93

Relativity, sophistic, 146

Religion, 133, 135, 140, 168, 188, 194, 204

Revelator, the, 86, 87, 158, 160, 161, 168

Royce, Josiah, 88

Ru'ach, 15

Sabatier, Auguste, 16

Santayana, George, 16, 18, 19, 23, 44-46, 56, 123, 182, 183

Science, 106, 107, 109

Scott, E. F., 29n.

Semantics, 9, 24, 176

Shakespeare, 10

Shintoism, 51, 100

Sociology, 107, 133

Socrates, 35, 41, 44, 101

Sorley, W. R., 168

Spirit: as conscious experience, 20, 21; as courageous experience, 29-30; dependence on personality, 55-58; dialectic of, 17; Divine, 91, 102, 109, 125, 126, 128, 129, 135-42, 146, 148, 151, 154, 162, 174, 188, 193, 206, 212; empirical investigation of, 103; Eternal, 77, 134, 149-55, 159, 174; etymology of, 15; evil, 140, 141, 162, 210; as experience of freedom, 30-33; as experience of second blessing, 13; "from on high," 17-20; good or bad, 47; Hegel's Objective, 48-52, 87-99; Holy, 9, 13, 23, 28, 34, 35, 104, 105, 121, 123, 124, 127, 138; individual, 78-80; as noble conscious experience, 24, 25; as personal experience, 35-37; potential, 59-64; as power, 17-20; as powerful experience, 21-24; as rational experience, 33, 34; as

INDEX

- rich conscious experience, 25-27;
as system of personal values, 64-
68; unity of personal, 99-102; as
"vague," 9, 37
- Spiritus*, 15
- State, the, 48-52, 57; socialized,
105
- Stephen, St., 30
- Stern, William, 101
- Streeter, B. H., 16
- Stylites, St. Simeon, 150
- Subjectivism, 110-12, 115, 117
- Tennyson, 126
- Tertullian, 14, 155
- Theodotos, 14
- Thomas à Kempis, 15
- Thomas, G. F., 16
- Thucydides, 177
- Thumos*, 15, 28, 42
- Tolstoy, Leo, 86
- Trinity, the, 72
- Truth, as spiritual value, 113-15,
117, 155-57
- Tyranny, 212
- Uncle Sam, 51
- Unendliche Aufgaben*, 151
- Value, 64-67, 116-25; increase in
quantity of, 167-73
- Verstehende Psychologie*, 82
- Wesley, John, 65
- Whitehead, A. N., 55, 59, 62, 124
- Wieman, H. N., 155
- Woolman, John, 15
- Worship, 126; experience of, 127-
35; Shinto, 51; as spiritual
value, 155, 157, 158
- Zeitgeist*, 35, 88, 210

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

Edgar Sheffield Brightman

Dr. Brightman gives a much-needed and precise definition of the terms SPIRIT and SPIRITUAL, stripping them of misconceptions and ambiguity. Basing his study on his knowledge of history and philosophy, he identifies the marks of the spirit, finding that its meanings center around a life of ideal values, values both personal and social. He aims at a sympathetic understanding of those who seek the blessing of the Holy Spirit, while at the same time warning against abuses and excesses of, "spiritual" experience.

In a universe of tensions, says Dr. Brightman, the Divine Spirit is the common goal and the source of all that lifts man's life out of material limitations into an eternal, active, and purposive freedom. Upon that higher level man discovers that spiritual ideals are grounded in the very nature of existence, and that goodness will triumph over evil. The power of spirit, active in our earthly life, has its source on high, in the eternal divine values.

"The ideal is not lowered by being made real; but real life is elevated. . . . All words for spirit are words of life. . . . Spirit is conscious, powerful, noble, rich, courageous, free, rational, personal experience. . . . The life of value as a whole is the spiritual life. . . . The unspiritual is the narrow, the merely sensuous, the transient, the petty life. . . . Persons are a curious mixture of individuality and sociality of privacy and publicity. . . . No ascetic family, no spiritually isolated nation, no other-worldly church, but a family, a nation, and a church that can breathe into bones and dust the breath of life—that is the Objective Spirit that we need today, the transforming power of spirit in civilization. . . . Man's highest social thought is not humanity, or nature, but God. . . . The ancient problem of the meaning of life finds a solution in the unfaltering purpose of the eternal Good Spirit. . . . Religious faith is faith in the eternity of spirit. . . . Spiritual life in the best sense is a raising of man's purposes nearer to the level of divine purposes. . . . A spiritual universe is one in which the truly desirable is eventually available. . . . Nothing can take away man's longing for the highest values, or his loyalty to them. No totalitarians, no wars, no fears, famines, or perils of any kind can really break a man's spirit, until he breaks it himself by surrendering. Tyranny has many dread powers, but not the power to rule the spirit."

The Author

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN received his A.B. and A.M. degrees from Brown University, and his S.T.B. and Ph.D. degrees from Boston University. He studied also at the Universities of Berlin and Marburg, Germany. Before accepting his present position as Professor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of Boston University, he had served on the faculties of Brown, Nebraska Wesleyan, and Wesleyan. He has been guest lecturer at many of the nation's outstanding educational institutions, including Harvard, Duke, and Vanderbilt Universities. He is past president of the American Philosophical Association and the American Theological Society, and in 1942 is president of the National Association of Biblical Instructors.

Dr. Brightman's previous publications include: THE SOURCES OF THE HEXATEUCH. AN INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY. IMMORTALITY IN POST-KANTIAN IDEALISM. RELIGIOUS VALUES. A PHILOSOPHY OF IDEALS. IS GOD A PERSON? THE PROBLEM OF GOD. THE FINDING OF GOD. MORAL LAWS. PERSONALITY AND RELIGION. THE FUTURE OF CHRISTIANITY. A PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



140 751

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY